MAY 8 19[illegible]

The American Political Science Review

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Everett S. Brown, University of Michigan
Harwood L. Childs, Princeton University
Robert E. Cushman, Cornell University
Russell H. Fitzgibbon, Univ. of California (L.A.)
Fritz Morstein Marx, Bureau of the Budget
Lennox A. Mills, University of Minnesota
Louise Overacker, Wellesley College
Charles C. Rohlfing, University of Pennsylvania
Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College
Carl B. Swisher, Johns Hopkins University
Frederic A. Ogg, Managing Editor, University of Wisconsin

VOL. XL APRIL, 1946 NO. 2

CONTENTS

A Job Analysis of Political Science	John M. Gaus	217
Constitutional Law in 1944–45	Robert E. Cushman	231
American Government and Politics: The First Session of the Seventy-ninth Congress	Floyd M. Riddick	256
Political Parties in New York City	Hugh A. Bone	272
Politics and Ethics—A Symposium: I. Politics, Science, and Ethics	Gabriel A. Almond	283
II. Political Processes and Judgments of Value	Lewis A. Dexter	294
III. Politics and Ethics: A Reply to John H. Hallowell	William F. Whyte	301
IV. Politics and Ethics: A Rejoinder to William F. Whyte	John H. Hallowell	307
News and Notes, Personal and Miscellaneous	Managing Editor	313
Forty-first Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association	Harvey Walker	321
Book Reviews and Notices		352
Recent Publications of Political Interest: Books and Periodicals	M. Q. and M. H. Sibley	402
Government Publications	Miles O. Price	424
Notes on Some Recent Documentary Materials	James B. Childs	433

(For list of Book Reviews, see next page)

Published Bimonthly by

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Publication Office, 450–458 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis.

Editorial Office
209 South Hall
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Secretary of the Association
1822 Sheridan Road
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Foreign Agents, P. S. King and Staples, Ltd., Great Smith St., Westminster, London

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wis., under the Act of August 4, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 12, 1926.

Made in the United States of America

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Orton, The Liberal Tradition. George H. Sabine 352
Bryn-Jones, Toward a Democratic New Order. Thomas I. Cook 353
Frank, Fate and Freedom. Arthur N. Holcombe 356
Quintana, Los Partidos Politicos, Instrumentos de Gobierno. Austin F. Macdonald 357
Swisher, The Growth of Constitutional Power in the United States. Robert K. Carr 358
Jackson, Full Faith and Credit. Oliver P. Field 360
Smith, The Management of Your Government. Charles S. Ascher. 361
White (*ed.*), Civil Service in Wartime. J. Donald Kingsley 362
Brecht, Federalism and Regionalism in Germany; *Dickinson*, The Regions of Germany. Carl J. Friedrich 364
Hayes, Wartime Mission in Spain. Dana G. Munro 366
Laserson, Russia and the Western World. Merle Fainsod 367
Janowsky, Nationalities and National Minorities. Winifred N. Hadsel 368
Jaffe, New Frontiers in Asia. Harold M. Vinacke 370
Pastuhov, A Guide to the Practice of International Conferences. Llewellyn Pfankuchen 371
Ranshofen-Wertheimer, The International Secretariat; *Jenks*, The Headquarters of International Institutions, William T. R. Fox. 372
Hexner, International Cartels. C. Herman Pritchett 374
Drake and Cayton, Black Metropolis. Harold F. Gosnell 375
Briefer Notices 377

Adams, Big Business in a Democracy; *Levenstein*, Labor Today and Tomorrow; *Blakey and Blakey*, Sales Taxes and Other Excises; *Liberman*, Building Lenin's Russia; *Lamont*, The Peoples of the Soviet Union; *Lowie*, The German People; *Wythe*, Industry in Latin America; *Anon.*, The Mandates System; *Warburg*, Unwritten Treaty; *Purves*, The Internal Administration of an International Secretariat; *Knorr*, World Rubber and Its Regulation; *Moore*, Soviet Far Eastern Policy; *Laserson*, Poland and Russia; *Chase*, Tomorrow's Trade; *Alinsky*, Reveille for Radicals.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, published bimonthly, is supplied to all members of the American Political Science Association. The annual dues are $5.00 a year ($3.00 for graduate and undergraduate students). $1.00 should be added for foreign postage.

Current issues, $1.00 per copy. Prices of other issues, and of complete volumes, are listed near the end of this number.

Applications for membership, orders for the REVIEW, and remittances should be addressed to 450–458 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis., or to Kenneth Colegrove, 1822 Sheridan Road, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Correspondence concerning contributions to the REVIEW—also books submitted for review—should be addressed to Frederic A. Ogg, Managing Editor, 209 South Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Articles and notes in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*.

Copyright, 1946, by the American Political Science Association.

The American
Political Science Review

VOL. XL APRIL, 1946 NO. 2

A JOB ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE*

JOHN M. GAUS
University of Wisconsin

Sentiment alone does not send my thoughts back to the first meeting of the Association which I attended—that held in Washington in December, 1920, a quarter of a century ago. You will have no time for that, although, perhaps, entry into a guild and fellowship has its appropriate niche for each of us, and so in some measure plays a collective rôle. The times and circumstances then and now, however, have useful common elements; both meetings followed and follow a world war; both reflect an atmosphere of exhaustion and of worry, of unsettlement, and also of new challenges to effort in the reshaping of things.

But lately I have been recalling particularly words spoken at that earlier meeting by the then Secretary of War, Newton Baker, when he addressed the assembled Associations. Some of you will remember how vividly he described an episode in an American offensive in France, when he stood beside the commanding officer in a small hut, the maps and charts before them, and messages poured in as the hour of assault arrived and the troops moved forward. After a time came an appeal from an advanced unit requesting the barrage to be lifted, as their objective was won. The commander studied the maps and charts. "Continue the barrage," he ordered; "we cannot yet have reached that point." Later, after the battle was over and prisoners were being questioned, the message was traced to an enemy officer who had thus tried to trick the Americans and had faked the appeal. Secretary Baker drove home his point. "Who, in times of peace, will similarly perform the task of that officer, in detecting from the flood of every conceivable kind of appeal on innumerable issues, of weighing the elements behind the appeal and ruling decisively, for purposes of action, what is true

* Presidential address delivered before the American Political Science Association at its forty-first annual meeting, Philadelphia, Pa., March 28, 1946.

and what is false?" For the development of such critical thinking, of judgment based on knowledge, in society, he urged, such scholars as the political scientists and the historians, whose Associations he was addressing, have a major responsibility.

We have all had the experience some time of reading a news dispatch or hearing a broadcast concerning some episode or place with which we have personal acquaintance, and of noting in the account some statement which we know from our own first hand acquaintance to be untrue as reported. The point may seem minor, such as the location of a place, or the assignment of an office to a person; yet the inaccuracy may make us feel skeptical of the accuracy of the major point of the report by assuring us that the person reporting is not himself at home and thoroughly familiar with the subject he is reporting. Or the apparently minor point may actually be the key to the whole episode, so that when one removes it as untrue from the context, the entire account becomes worthless; or the point reported may be true in itself, but needing for proper evaluation surrounding and qualifying data which are not given. The problem presented to the reader or listener in such circumstances is relatively easy. He knows; he has been there; perhaps he has participated in the event; and he can reach quickly a relatively objective estimate of the report. But for most of us, at most times, getting the raw data, to say nothing of its setting, is more difficult, and we have neither the leisure, nor the personal equipment, nor the resistance to distraction, equal to the task of being citizens.

In the period since Secretary Baker spoke, the task has become more complicated. The tempo of change is more swift—no longer a moderate adjustment to a major change in a generation, but for our own generation two world wars and a world depression to assimilate. We were more than a century in the change from an eighty per cent farm-resident to an eighty per cent non-farm-resident society in the United States; the passage into a series of dominant metropolitan communities has been more rapid. Within those communities, within a briefer time a movement from the central mother city to the suburbs has proceeded swiftly. Nor have the farm and forest areas been unchanged. An earlier progression from forests and forest employments to cattle-raising and arable farming has faltered, slowed down, and even been reversed as farm lands judged sub-marginal begin to be gathered into areas marked for reforestation. In 1879, Major Powell, in his famous report on the Arid

Lands, urged a reappraisal of our land settlement policies and standards and a program of coöperative grazing and water control associations in the plains. Over fifty years later, the Report on the Great Plains, the Taylor Grazing Act, the Water Facilities Act, the Soil Conservation and Shelter Belt and Farm Security Programs, were all illustrations of the recognition of problems of change and adjustment whose need Powell had foreseen. The course of forest policy is equally instructive. Turner records the socially supported attitude of a Middle Western territorial delegate to Congress who protested the prosecution of persons taking lumber from the public lands as unfriendly to the builders of new communities. The statute books and public reports of the same area have in the last twenty years recorded forest crop legislation, land use classification and zoning, and the establishment of public forest preserves.

These illustrations of change are from what may appear to be the simpler, natural elements in the life of a community. In transportation, industry, commerce, and finance, the examples would be more complex, such as the public facilitation of insurance of bank deposits or mortgages on houses, the regulation of rates and services of railroads, motor trucking, or air transport services; the subsidizing of the merchant marine, or the production and marketing of various goods and services; or the establishing of procedures in the conduct of industrial relations. Each one of you will be familiar in some detail, many of you as pioneer participants, in some activity of this kind. Your very familiarity will have encouraged, perhaps, a weariness with the topic, a sense of the extreme difficulty of formulating programs that permit substantial justice to all those affected, a discouragement at the technical difficulties in applying effectively the most wisely conceived general policy when one is immersed in immediate problems of administration, and awareness of the difficulty of understanding on the part of the mass of citizens whom one is endeavoring to serve. And we are confronted by the effects upon this intricate system of depression and war, with all the exacerbating of personal worries into group hatreds and suspicions, with all the dislocations and destructions which have at once invaded not only the most gigantic economic and political organizations but the careers and homes of the humblest persons. No wonder there is so much a sense of frustration and exhaustion, at the very moment when such difficult decisions have to be taken.

In the preface to his play *John Bull's Other Island*, Bernard Shaw speaks of political hatred as "the only hatred that civilization allows to be mortal hatred." We have had it raw and strong for a long time. Perhaps it flourishes the greater because the tempo and extent of change of which I have been speaking have brought such inner uncertainty to so many people of all groups, incomes, and other external circumstances. It leads everyone to some escape—an escape from freedom, as one writer has put it, or perhaps an escape to some relief in seeking a personal or group superiority to others—at its extreme, to sadism and persecution. This circumstance reminds me of a phrase Gilbert Murray employed in a discussion of Greek religion in the Hellenistic period—"the failure of nerve." For there is a useful comparison to be made between our period and that. A period of civil war and the clash of rival city states and their empires had resulted in the engulfment of them all by the Macedonian Empire of Philip and Alexander. The appeal of Isocrates and others to revise and enlarge their loyalties through a peaceful federation was unsuccessful. Nor was this all. Alexander expanded enormously the area of contact and acquaintance, at least superficially, of the Greeks with Eastern peoples, and planted in the near East and Egypt new cities deliberately planned to incorporate a mixture of peoples of different cultures. As a symbolism of the new synthesis, and to produce a cement for the new and vast political system, as well as to quiet and submerge the tradition of participation of persons as citizens in public affairs, a conception of the ruler as having divine attributes was fostered, facilitated doubtless by some borrowings from mystery cults and strange dogmas coming out of the newly and superficially conquered lands stretching to the valley of the Indus. The effort to assimilate within a single system the varied attitudes and customs of East and West, coming so swiftly after the collapse of the known and explored apparent security of the City State, was too much for the nerve which had sustained the attempt to inquire coolly and skeptically and reasonably concerning the nature of the universe and man and his institutions. In a charted world, Murray points out, science and philosophy will be produced because there is confidence in experience and reason, and dangers and terrors are matters to be explored in sober spirit, sustained by society, and with a recognition of one's duties to it. But when the charts are lost, or are demonstrably useless, where war, famine, and anarchy are present, where there seems

to be no relation between responsible human effort and measurable results, where vast new possibilities, uncertainties, threats, and strange new knowledge have somehow to get fitted into the scheme of things, the nerve fails. What efforts at orderly inquiry and creation persist are attacked or viewed with extreme suspicion and distrust at the time when they are needed most.

In our time it is not the city state but the national state which, after some centuries of evolution out of the king's household, has revealed its inadequacies in relations beyond its borders as human activities and interest spill over them and their imperial accumulations. The attempts at solving the difficulty by New Orders that are old empires writ large do not inspire much confidence. Within the national state, it is only here and there, chiefly in a few relatively small and homogeneous communities, that people have achieved some more successful processing of skills and resources into a standard of living and way of life that seem capable of absorbing at least internal change, and even these fortunate communities are the early prey of the leviathans. And now has come for us all, everywhere, again the problem of reaching some adequate assimilation of ideas and practices of both the East and the West.

The situation was foreseen and discussed by Henry Adams in his *The Education of Henry Adams*, a book which seems to me of major importance for us for many reasons. He interprets, for example, two other postwar periods in our history—those following the Civil War and the Spanish American War; and in both he had a personal stake in attempting to penetrate and interpret events. In the first period, he had, like his brother, and indeed his generation, a personal choice of career to be made. He chose to go to Washington and to attempt a new kind of journalism, one which might interpret events and institutions to American citizens. Those articles—such as, for example, the one on "Civil Service Reform," on the sessions of Congress, and on the railroad financing of the period are worthy of our study today. I am more concerned here to point out that his appraisals of the post-civil war decade in these articles and in his subsequent *Education* stress the fact of change, of the dissolving of values and the sense of need of deliberate institution and process invention and building; and then stress the task, presented by events and illustrated by his own efforts, of interpreting to the citizen what was happening, how it was affecting our institutions, and what needed to be done.

"It required," he wrote, "all the new machinery to be created—capital, banks, mines, furnaces, shops, power-houses, technical knowledge, mechanical population, together with a steady remodelling of social and political habits, ideas, and institutions to fit the new scale and the new institutions."

Twenty years later, a self-styled stable-companion to friends active in public affairs, he was noting the implications of the Spanish War on the one hand and the new physics, which he began to study under the guidance of his friend Langley on the other. He knew, he remarked, that we would have to take Puerto Rico, but he wished we might escape the Philippines! And he noted, when he heard in Paris of the Boxer Rebellion, that while he realized that in the twentieth century the struggle for the control of China would be the major fact, in London and Paris the news was interpreted chiefly in terms of fall in the value of a Ming vase. But just as he had sensed in 1879 the importance of the work of his friends Hewitt and King in establishing a central agency for surveying our natural resources and formulating policies concerning them, so twenty years later he concluded that the North Atlantic had become an integral unit. "From Hammerfest to Cherbourg on one shore of the ocean—from Halifax to Norfolk on the other—one great empire was ruled by one great emperor—Coal. Political and human jealousies might tear it apart or divide it, but the power and the empire were one." And later, speaking of the fall of Port Arthur, he wrote: "For the first time in fifteen hundred years a true Roman *pax* was in sight."

The Pacific would have to be brought, at least in thought and policy-making, into relation with the Atlantic. For the new forms of application of energy were such that some guidance of the concentrated controls which they invited, and even compelled, had become the first task of domestic and international politics.

The same prophetic note was being struck by F. J. Turner in his address on the Frontier at the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893, when he concluded that the next stage in American life would no longer be shaped by the frontier conditions; by John W. Burgess, who already had founded at Columbia University a Graduate School of Political Science in recognition of the new American situation and its needs; by John Bates Clark and other economists whose object in organizing the American Economic Association also reflected an interpretation of contemporary events and needs; and by Woodrow Wilson, in his paper on "The Study of Administration," published in the first volume of the *Political Science Quarterly*

that was one of the early fruits of Burgess' planning. Wilson, like Turner (and the two discussed together their country and its problems much in their Johns Hopkins days) realized that a new America had, in the post-Civil War period, come into existence, and that its administrative and legislative institutions should be reappraised for the new tasks of government which he foresaw.

This effort to record and interpret one's times so that we may better order our work was illustrated again at the meeting of our Association in 1920 at which Secretary Baker spoke. I recall the paper which Charles E. Merriam read—I think the title was "Political Prudence"—in which the tasks to be undertaken and areas of thought to be invaded were presented. I recall, too, with gratitude its note of welcome and encouragement to the new apprentices.

Precedent at least, if not the possession of special insight, supports me when I emphasize our rôle in this postwar period, indicate difficulties, and make suggestions. The extent and rapidity of change in wartime create new situations to be interpreted. It is true that much of that change is physical, and sometimes highly technical. But much of the adjustment that men may make to such change must come through the use of government. Nor is that fact applicable only to such dramatic developments as the atomic bomb, radar, jet propulsion, or penicillin. I have spoken of the new—but long developing—problems of both urban and rural communities. I should underline the point, in returning to these illustrations of our job, that there is no clear separation, in the attack upon these problems, of physical or social research. The researches of botanist, biologist, or engineer that result in changes in farm management cannot be considered to have answered the problems of a farm and the life of those dependent on it. The new commodity, or breed, or machinery is only one part of an organism that is affected by forces beyond the fences of the farm—prices, roads, schools, consumer purchasing power. In the forest cut-over regions to be found now in so many parts of our country, the problem of family income and community life involves the nicest dovetailing of factors of production, market, and price with local, county, state, and national policies relating to land use, highways, schools, relief, money grants, and—perhaps most important of all—obtaining personnel experienced not only in various special substantive fields such as forestry or soils or recreational programs, but in the legislative and administrative integration of the different policies to each local unit and indeed each farm or forest. Similarly providing assistance

to some country in need requires not only the physical materials and transport, but a personnel with some awareness of the problems of formulating and administering an international policy; of the characteristic difficulties that have been encountered in such enterprises; of the devices and procedures that have been found useful; and of the culture of the area to be aided. I am impressed by the recognition, in the statements of many of the physical scientists who participated in the atomic bomb project, of the area of research and interpretation of institutional policy, organization, and procedure into which the physical research must be integrated. Similarly, the problems of the metropolitan area go beyond the application of engineering research techniques to roads, houses, sewers, and water supply; they are essential. But equally essential are a clearer theory of the metropolitan area as an organic unit requiring political expression; political devices, for the shaping of which studies in comparative government, public law, and public administration can contribute, whereby the local neighborhood, the historic municipalities, and the organic whole may be integrated; and a public reporting which will be capable of explaining to the citizen the nature of his community and conveying back what the citizen thinks and feels about it.

In a memorandum on "The Atomic Bomb and American Security" by Bernard Brodie published by the Institute of International Studies of Yale University, there is a relevant example of a political scientist attacking the substantive problem created by the recent work in atomic physics as applied to the waging of war. At one point in his diagnosis, his treatment of what he terms "vulnerability control" leads him to the topic of urban planning. My own first reaction to the fact of the atomic bomb as related to city planning had been to reject outright, in view of its apparently cataclysmic influence on the methods of war, the usefulness of exploring changes in urban design. Dr. Brodie's suggestion of the possible value, in any total program, of the dispersal of certain types of industry, of the reduction of density of population, and of the danger of concentrating all political and administrative decision-making in a single urban center, not of course as the single response to the new threat, has led me to change my opinion. For in the attack upon war itself from which, as the author concludes, "the problem of the atomic bomb is inseparable," every measure which makes the war-maker hesitate because of the increased difficulty and cost of his aggression plays its part. My point is that there is

a further need for the political scientist, confronted as we are by this new source of change in our environment, as interpreter and appraiser and inventor, and that in all these rôles he will be most useful if he builds cumulatively on the research he has been doing on already known institutions. I found myself, for example, turning again to materials on regional centers, on the future rôle of state governments, on state capitals as contrasted with regional centers, on the experience of Great Britain during the war with regional commissioners, and a plexus of problems in political geography, comparative government, and administration. We have all, perhaps, been too inclined to leave the atomic bomb problem to our colleagues who work chiefly in the field of international relations. Certainly they have a great task and opportunity; but second thought convinces me that we must continue to cultivate our other gardens, and integrate our work generally with the institution-invention that must be done on the international level.

For we are confronted here by problems not only of organization and procedure, but of political behavior, of the relation described by Harold Lasswell in his phrase "World Conflict and Personal Insecurity." We confront the tasks of a new Hellenistic period which, like the old, experiences the failure of its chief political institution, and the necessity of reaching some working relationship of East and West; and, like the old Hellenistic period, has been experiencing so much human evil that it may despair of reason and retreat to cults and drugs. For those committed to reason, as our very title commits us, we cannot retreat; we must push the application of science further into the analysis of human behavior and institutions as the next step in the physical research which has brought the literally explosive new knowledge into its first application.

A science of materials and of plants and animals, of the landscape and the city-scape, is incomplete to man living in them if he does not complete it with a science of the institutions of the community whereby man may live at peace in that community and realize more nearly what he is capable of being as a man. The converse is also true; and perhaps its application to our work is that we each should familiarize ourselves with some substantive problem with which our governmental institutions are created to deal, so that we more clearly see for ourselves, and interpret to others, the incompleteness of one approach without the other; and see the importance, too, not only of social invention or physical

invention, but of new sensitiveness to design, to standards of living, to wider human sympathies and richer insights into what makes a community a better place in which to live.

I relate these to you obvious facts because apparently they are not so obvious to some others. I am impressed, in reading the testimony before the Kilgore Committee concerning the question of national policy of aid to research, by the dismissal of the social sciences as unworthy of or inappropriate for consideration in comparison with the natural sciences, and of the almost complete ignoring of the arts and literature. To enter our educational institutions with public assistance and prestige for one part only of our program of studies would in my judgment tend to distort the minds of students concerning the nature of the problems that confront this country and the interdependence everywhere of fields of knowledge itself. It is significant, I think, that the policy of aid to agricultural research through the experiment stations which was instituted in the 1880's was broadened forty-five years later from the physical sciences to include the social sciences and the problems of the farm as a home and as a civic and economic as well as a physical unit.

And so we must not suffer a failure of nerve from any doubting of the urgency and importance of our job. It is to record, to explain, to invent, as carefully, as honestly, and as responsibly as we can, the significance of physical, social, and intellectual change upon government as an instrument by means of which people first may live at all, and live better. Therein all our special fields, whether the study of comparative government, of public law, of political theory, of administration, of public opinion or international relations or any other of our special points of beginning, have a tremendous job to do. In concluding his book on "Education for Public Administration" a few years ago, George Graham stressed the importance to training of research, and remarked that in public administration we were now teaching all that we know, and probably beyond it. That is true in all our fields. And since we work in the larger field of government, perhaps we have a special challenge in this new Hellenistic age to prevent the disintegration of confidence of people to govern themselves, to find in reason and inquiry and peaceful processes of discussion and debate a method of problem-solving superior to political hatred, suppression, and sadism. For an interdependent society, a large part of which the world over has become urban and metropolitan, whatever its local economic programs, is dependent upon government, and takes up

force, as our generation has twice witnessed, at an appalling cost.

This attempt at a job analysis of political science in our time should include, perhaps, a more overt recognition of and emphasis upon a phase that interests many. How can the knowledge of the expert be made more available to the layman? I think we shall not contribute much to an answer if we consider this a one-way process. My suggestion that, in addition to our concern for organization and process, the techniques of legislation or of adjudication, we acquaint ourselves with a substantive problem was made partly with this problem in mind. In such a study—perhaps in some civic activity in his local community, for example, the political scientist will learn as much as he teaches. He will better know how much time and energy and knowledge of what proportion of his neighbors are available for a political problem; of the distractions and apparent irrelevancies that intervene; of the special resources of knowledge and wisdom or liabilities of suspicion and hatred that must be envisaged in formulating a political problem or attempting its solution. If the political scientist has something to give, he will probably find that it wins respect. The incident may be local and petty, but the general truths it conveys may be widely applicable in his work. One does not need to sentimentalize about popular participation in affairs to recognize that the expert is more likely to be an expert if he knows better what people are concerned about, and how to explain the meaning, hitherto hidden to them, of events and institutions bound to affect them. His very research and teaching will have become another item of weight, however tiny, against a failure of nerve and faith in human effort. It was a nice compliment—and also practically successful—when Sidney Webb waged a parliamentary campaign in a Durham mining district by publishing a history of the Durham miners.

Probably most of our institutions of learning and the departments of political science within them are discussing, and have already acted or will act on, proposals for curricular change. The experiments in training instituted during the war need to be appraised, such as the idea of regional focus of studies, for example. The financing of research and the relation of public research needs to available personnel and the educational and research institutions are recognized as important questions. The education and recruitment of personnel for government administration and the clarifying to students of their civic obligations and opportunities will require a fresh appraisal. We have a special responsibility in working with

our colleagues in the high schools and teacher training colleges, and in adult education, in determining the place of political science in these programs, and also in the increasing number of programs in the field of industrial relations.

In these and related questions, our Association can serve us all through committee study and reporting; and perhaps on some questions, such as the conduct and support of government research and the qualifications for some positions in the public service, the Association will need to present some formulation of professional views.

The program of your meetings for tomorrow reflects these challenges and opportunities of our time. There is some skepticism of the value to the scholar of collective efforts; and yet while it is true that the individual scholar is the basic creative unit, it is also true that a corporative spirit and sense of fellowship may be useful and even essential to him, especially in periods of strife and confusion. If we survey our ground and take counsel together, there may be both substantial advantages to our personal plans for research and instruction, and professional and civic advantages in a cumulative advance in our science. And so a day is set aside, as we meet again after the break of the war years. We may draw upon the work done during those years by our Presidents, Program Committee Chairmen, our Secretary, and our Editor, and by Committees whom they appointed and put to work. Presidents Anderson, Cushman, and White, and Program Chairmen Stoke, Dimock, and Fesler provided for meetings during the war years which could only partially be realized. The Association can now express its gratitude to them for their trusteeship. At the meeting of the Executive Council in February, 1945, in receiving the report of the Committee on Research by its chairman, Ernest Griffith, the Council expressed the view that its findings should be widely disseminated among our members. When we learned last September that we might hold an Association meeting this winter, after the peak of troop movements in the holiday season, it seemed appropriate to carry out the wishes of the Council, to give a fresh start to the discussion and planning of research in political science, and to give greater opportunity than usual for the consideration of Association committee activities, by devoting most of one day of our meetings to the work of the Research Committee. We shall have, in addition to open panel sessions, a report from the Committee as a whole, and reports from the Committee on the Social Studies, which has served us well in coöperation with the National Council of the

Social Studies in exploring secondary school and teacher training questions, and from the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction. At our luncheon meeting there will be discussions of our rôle in the work of the Social Science Research Council. Let me here express the appreciation of our Association of the leadership which the Council has taken through its staff in aiding its constituent members to follow the question of national aid to research now before Congress. Saturday noon, we shall hear from the chairman and vice-chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Organization of Congress. The establishment of this study by Congress of its own organization is welcome to us in view of the stimulating and preparatory work of a committee of this Association, whose chairman, George Galloway, has been serving as a chief of staff to the Joint Committee of Congress.

I hope that the Association will take a further step in facilitating its planning of research and committee studies. A meeting annually of the Executive Council in early or late summer would make possible a better consideration of Association policy than the usual meeting at the time of the Association meeting permits. Since the membership of the Council is widely representative and the terms are overlapping, it can, given more opportunity for discussion, supply a more broadly based and continuous survey of committee activities, and formulate a balanced program and budget for the consideration of the annual meeting of the Association.

There is much to learn from the example of coöperation which marked the work of the physical scientists engaged in the atomic bomb project. Dr. Henry Smyth has described this coöperation in a recent article:[1]

"The development of the atomic bomb in the last five years was not a scientific experiment carried on under perfectly controlled conditions in a remote laboratory. It was the combined effort of thousands of men and women of varying nationalities and backgrounds, freely joining their knowledge and their abilities for a common objective. I believe we have something of value to learn from their experience.

"The purpose for which they worked, and to which they gave their full moral support, was the rapid ending of this war; the ending of all wars, they hoped. That is why the associations of scientists who worked on the atomic bomb have been so anxious to make clear the implications of atomic energy. . . .

[1] *The Survey Graphic*, Jan., 1946, p. 20.

"The men who developed the atomic bomb were willing to try radical ideas. They were willing to think in new ways, for in one section after another of the project they were doing things that had never been done before. It is interesting that, again and again, as they faced what seemed insuperable difficulties, they found that the so-called visionary idea proved in the end to be the practical one. I saw this happen many times in our work between 1940 and 1945.

"Now we stand at the beginning of the atomic age. I would suggest that we learn some lessons from the methods that brought it to birth. We must think in new ways to meet this new age. We have always been an adaptable people, with the saving heritage of common sense.

"Let us now be willing to delegate our national sovereignty to the larger sovereignty of world law—for nationalism will be suicide in the world we have created.

"Let us ask the suggestions of other nations about our common problems, and not attempt to use our momentarily powerful position to force our ideas on them.

"Let us be as anxious to find the weaknesses in our policies and conduct as we are to find them in the policies and conduct of our fellow-nations. Let us not expect too much too soon, but act like wise and reasonable men. In the revealing light of the atomic bomb, *our objective must be enduring peace.*"

The political scientist may well share this attitude toward methods of his colleagues in the physical sciences, and the work of both has become a more integrated enterprise. While at first sight the new physical forces would seem to create an entirely new setting, sober reconsideration reveals a new emphasis on older problems of international order, on the creation of a metropolitan political organism, of rural government, that better reflects natural resources and their wiser use, of better procedures in the formulation of public policy and reporting, of gaining more sympathetic insight into individuals and the making of communities. Some years ago, a contemporary poet suggested that the end of the world would come "not with a bang, but a whimper." Since last summer, many have accepted fatalistically the "bang" alternative. The political scientist can help in the avoidance of both by doing his job. For any achievement of gains, however slight, toward a reasonable solution of the problems of government contributes toward a renewal of confidence in reason itself and a strengthening of nerve.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW IN 1944-45

THE CONSTITUTIONAL DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE OCTOBER TERM, 1944

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN
Cornell University

The membership of the Supreme Court did not change during the 1944 term, but Mr. Justice Roberts resigned in July after the term had ended. Divisions in the Court were as numerous and as difficult to classify as before. Four justices dissented in twenty-seven cases, while three justices dissented in sixteen cases. The Court seems to be moving toward the old practice of the pre-Marshall period by which the justices wrote *seriatim* opinions. There is a depressing increase in the number of cases in which three, four, and even five justices feel impelled to write separate opinions.

A. QUESTIONS OF NATIONAL POWER

1. CASES ARISING FROM THE WAR

Evacuation and Relocation of Japanese-American Citizens. In 1943, in Hirabayashi v. United States,[1] the Supreme Court held the curfew regulations set up in military areas on the West Coast validly applicable to American citizens of Japanese ancestry although all other citizens were exempt; but it by-passed the much more important question whether the military evacuation of these Japanese-American citizens from the West Coast military areas was constitutional. In Korematsu v. United States,[2] a divided Court held the evacuation program valid. The majority opinion was written by Mr. Justice Black; Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurred briefly; Justices Roberts, Murphy, and Jackson each wrote a dissenting opinion.

In February, 1942, the President, by Executive Order No. 9066, authorized the creation of military areas from which any or all persons might be excluded, and with respect to which the right of persons to enter, or remain in, or leave, should be subject to such regulations as the military authorities might prescribe. Military areas were thereafter set up by the Commanding General of the Western Defense Command, the first and most important of which was Military Area No. 1, comprising the entire West Coast from Canada to Mexico to an average depth of about 40 miles. By a statute passed on March 21, 1942, Congress imposed criminal penalties upon those who violated the military regulations set up in these

[1] 320 U.S. 81, 1943. See this REVIEW, Vol. 38, p. 266.
[2] 323 U.S. 214, 1944.

military areas. In creating Military Area No. 1, General De Witt announced that he would evacuate from this area all persons of suspected loyalty, all alien enemies, and all aliens and citizens alike of Japanese ancestry. Originally, the Japanese-American citizens were allowed to leave the military area upon their own initiative and go to places of their own choice. This plan worked badly. The evacuation proceeded slowly, and the evacuees were met by hostility in most of the places to which they moved. On March 26, therefore, voluntary evacuation was stopped by a freezing order which forbade enemy aliens or American citizens of Japanese ancestry to leave any military area except by official permission and under government regulations. In the meantime, "relocation centers" were being set up under the newly created War Relocation Authority, and by June 1, the compulsory transfer to these relocation centers of 112,000 Japanese, including 70,000 American citizens, was completed.

Korematsu lived in that part of Military Area No. 1 from which by Civilian Exclusion Order No. 34 all persons of Japanese ancestry were excluded after May 8. All these persons were ordered to report at a stated time to a Civil Control Station for instructions to go to an assembly center. Refusal to comply with this order was punishable under the act of March 21. Korematsu defied this order, was convicted under the statute, and was later sent to a relocation center. No question was raised of his loyalty to the United States.

Mr. Justice Black's opinion for the majority of the Court followed closely the opinion in the Hirabayashi case. The evacuation program rests constitutionally upon the belief by competent military authorities that "gravest imminent danger" to the public safety existed at the time it was ordered. Like the curfew, "exclusion from the military area has a definite and close relationship to the prevention of espionage and sabotage." Like the curfew, the exclusion of these Japanese-American citizens was justified because of the acute danger arising from the "presence of an unascertained number of disloyal members of the group, most of whom we have no doubt were loyal to this country," and the impossibility (in the judgment of the military authorities) of "an immediate segregation of the disloyal from the loyal." The Court cited in support of the reality of this alleged danger the fact that later "approximately 5,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry refused to swear unqualified allegiance to the United States and to renounce allegiance to the Japanese Emperor, and several thousand evacuees requested repatriation to Japan."

It was vigorously urged that the evacuation orders were in reality grounded in race prejudice and that Korematsu had been thrown into a concentration camp solely because of his race and without evidence or inquiry regarding his loyalty and good behavior. This Mr. Justice Black vigorously denied. He concluded his opinion with this statement: "To cast

this case into outlines of race prejudice, without reference to the real military dangers which were presented, merely confuses the issue. Korematsu was not excluded from the Military Area because of hostility to him or his race. He *was* excluded because we are at war with the Japanese Empire, because the properly constituted military authorities feared an invasion of our West Coast and felt constrained to take proper security measures, because they decided that the military urgency of the situation demanded that all citizens of Japanese ancestry be segregated from the West Coast temporarily, and finally, because Congress, reposing its confidence in this time of war in our military leaders—as inevitably it must—determined that they should have the power to do just this. There was evidence of disloyalty on the part of some, the military authorities considered that the need for action was great, and time was short. We cannot—by availing ourselves of the calm perspective of hindsight—now say that at that time these actions were unjustified."

One less basic, though persuasive point was urged on the Court. On May 30, the date on which Korematsu was charged with remaining unlawfully in the prohibited area, there were two conflicting military orders outstanding, one forbidding him to remain in the area, the other forbidding him to leave, but ordering him to report to an assembly center. Thus he was punished for doing what it was made a crime to fail to do. The Court held the orders not to be contradictory, since the requirement to report to the assembly center was merely a step in an orderly program of compulsory evacuation from the area.

The three dissenting opinions each rested on a different ground. Mr. Justice Roberts stressed the conflict between the military orders, one of which required Korematsu to leave the district, while the other forbade him to go save *via* an assembly center,—"a euphemism for a prison." Granting that in an emergency temporary exclusion from a locality may be valid, the facts show that the exclusion in this case "was but a part of an over-all plan for forcible detention." The two conflicting orders "were nothing but a cleverly devised trap to accomplish the real purpose of the military authority, which was to lock him up in a concentration camp."

Mr. Justice Murphy centered his attack upon the sufficiency of the military finding that the mass evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry was indispensable to the protection of the public security. While military discretion in such matters must be accorded great respect, "it is essential that there be definite limits to military discretion, especially where martial law has not been declared." Those limits were passed in this case, since there was no evidence that there was an "immediate, imminent, and impending" public danger sufficient to justify the bald and brutal race discrimination against American citizens here involved. The exclusion did not rest upon a showing of public danger, but upon an

assumption "that all persons of Japanese ancestry may have a dangerous tendency to commit sabotage and espionage and to aid our Japanese enemy in other ways." This assumption was unsupportable, and there was no convincing evidence that any substantial number of individuals of Japanese origin were in any way disloyal. The exclusion was based, not on a demonstrated public necessity, but upon "an accumulation of much of the misinformation, half-truths, and insinuations that for years have been directed against Japanese-Americans by people with racial and economic prejudices." The Japanese-Americans were entitled to be dealt with "on an individual basis by holding investigations and hearings to separate the loyal from the disloyal." The assertion that the loyalties of the group "were unknown and time was of the essence" is refuted by the fact that the first exclusion order was not issued until four months after Pearl Harbor, and the last one not until eight months had elapsed. The evacuation was not completed for eleven months. "It seems incredible that under these circumstances it would have been impossible to hold loyalty hearings for the mere 112,000 persons involved—or at least for the 70,000 American citizens—especially when a large part of this number represented children and elderly men and women."

Mr. Justice Jackson also emphasized the naked racial discrimination involved in the exclusion order violated by Korematsu. He stated that under our system of law guilt is personal and not inheritable, but that "here is an attempt to make an otherwise innocent act a crime merely because this prisoner is the son of parents as to whom he had no choice, and belongs to a race from which there is no way to resign." Such action fails to meet any of the conventional tests of constitutional law. Mr. Justice Jackson then proposed a novel and interesting solution of the conflict between military necessity and individual rights. He admits that "defense measures will not, and often should not, be held within the limits that bind civil authority in peace. . . . A military commander . . . issues orders, and they may have a certain authority as military commands, although they may be very bad as constitutional law." He felt unable to reach a conclusion as to whether the exclusion orders were or were not "reasonably expedient military precautions. . . . But even if they were permissible military procedures, I deny that it follows that they are constitutional." Mr. Justice Jackson explains and justifies this statement as follows: "A judicial construction of the due process clause that will sustain this order is a far more subtle blow to liberty than the promulgation of the order itself. A military order, however unconstitutional, is not apt to last longer than the military emergency. . . . But once a judicial opinion rationalizes such an order to show that it conforms to the Constitution, or rather rationalizes the Constitution to show that the Constitution sanctions such an order, the Court for all time has validated the principle of racial dis-

crimination in criminal procedure and of transplanting American citizens. . . . A military commander may overstep the bounds of constitutionality, and it is an incident. But if we review and approve, that passing incident becomes the doctrine of the Constitution. . . . I should hold that a civil court cannot be made to enforce an order which violates constitutional limitations even if it is a reasonable exercise of military authority . . . I do not suggest that the courts should have attempted to interfere with the Army in carrying out its task. But I do not think they may be asked to execute a military expedient that has no place in law under the Constitution."

While a divided Court held valid in the Korematsu case the discriminatory mass evacuation from military areas of all persons of Japanese decent, a unanimous Court held, in *Ex parte* Endo,[3] that a loyal American citizen of Japanese ancestry cannot constitutionally be detained in a war relocation center, but must be unconditionally released. Mitsuye Endo, a girl born in this country of Japanese parents and therefore an American citizen, was sent to a relocation center, from which in this case she sought release through *habeas corpus*. The government conceded that Miss Endo is a loyal and law-abiding citizen, not detained on any charge and not even suspected of disloyalty. In fact, she had applied for "leave clearance," and this had been granted. This leave clearance, however, did not permit departure from the relocation center except under the conditions and restrictions established by the War Relocation Authority. These conditions and restrictions were part of a program and policy designed to guarantee that there should not be "a dangerously disorderly migration of unwanted people to unprepared communities," but that the Japanese-American citizens of ascertained loyalty should go under the guidance and with the approval of the Authority to such places and at such times as seemed to it to promise suitable and satisfactory conditions. This meant concretely that permission to leave would not be granted unless the applicant had the assured prospect of a job and a place to live approved by the Authority. Nor would he be allowed to go to a locality "where it has been ascertained that community sentiment is unfavorable," or to one which has "not been cleared for relocation," nor into any prohibited military area, "including those from which these people were evacuated."

The Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Douglas, held that Miss Endo must be given her liberty immediately. It rested its decision, not on constitutional grounds, but upon a fair construction of the statutes and executive orders upon which the evacuation and relocation programs rested. It must be assumed that the purpose of these was "to allow for the greatest possible accommodation between those liberties [of the citizen] and the

[3] 323 U.S. 283, 1944.

exigencies of war." Their single purpose was to protect the war effort against espionage and sabotage. The initial part of the plan was to remove these people from designated areas, and the latter part was to afford them "transportation, food, shelter, and other accommodations." There is no evidence of an intention to detain them longer than was necessary to effect the central purpose of security against espionage and sabotage. It is clear that "a citizen who is concededly loyal presents no problem of espionage or sabotage. . . . He who is loyal is by definition not a spy or a saboteur." It follows, therefore, that the authority to detain a citizen ends when his loyalty is conceded. To hold otherwise would be to justify the detention of Japanese-American citizens, not on grounds relevant to military necessity, but purely on grounds of race. The continued detention of loyal citizens, even though temporary and even perhaps for their own interests, cannot be upheld on the ground alleged by the government that such detention "is an essential step in the evacuation program."

The Court's opinion left open the question whether Miss Endo, now unconditionally released, could have returned to a military area from which persons of Japanese ancestry were still barred. The revocation of the exclusion orders at the same time these decisions were handed down made this a moot question. In separate concurring opinions, Justices Murphy and Roberts urged that the original evacuation orders were invalid, that the petitioner is entitled to her freedom on clear constitutional grounds, and that she would, therefore, be entitled to go to any place in the country to which any other loyal citizen has the right to go.

Treason. In Cramer v. United States,[4] the Supreme Court for the first time in its history reviewed a conviction for the crime of treason, and in so doing analyzed the nature of treason and the kind and measure of evidence required to prove it. The prosecution of Cramer resulted from his association with two of the German saboteurs who landed in this country in 1942 and whose trial by a military commission was sustained by the Court in *Ex parte* Quirin[5] in 1942. Cramer was born in Germany, served in the German Army in 1918, came to this country in 1925, and was naturalized in 1936. He appears to have been a quiet, intelligent, and law-abiding person. He retained a strong affection for Germany. Before Pearl Harbor, he opposed our entrance into war with Germany, but there is no evidence, apart from the acts charged against him in this case, that he said or did anything disloyal to this country after we entered the war.

Cramer was a close friend of Werner Thiel, later one of the German

[4] 325 U.S. 1, 1945. In filing its brief on reargument, the government submitted appendices (404 pages) containing elaborate studies of the history of the law of treason in civil and in canon law, and in Anglo-American law. These were prepared at the request of the Solicitor General by distinguished legal scholars.

[5] See the writer's note on this case in this REVIEW, Vol. 36, p. 1082.

saboteurs, and lived with him in New York from 1937 to 1941, at which time Thiel, an ardent Nazi, returned to Germany. Cramer corresponded with Thiel in Germany. On June 17, 1942, Thiel, as a member of a group of four saboteurs led by Edward Kerling, landed from a German submarine near Jacksonville, Florida. Thiel and Kerling came to New York and registered at a hotel under assumed names. The next day a note was slipped under Cramer's door urging him to meet "Franz from Chicago" at a specified time and place. Cramer said he knew no "Franz," but kept the appointment and met Thiel. He admitted that he knew Thiel had come from Germany. He asked him if he had been brought by German submarine and Thiel answered evasively. Thiel said he had "three and a half or four thousand dollars" with him, and that "if you have the right kind of connections you can even get dollars in Germany." Cramer offered to keep Thiel's money for him, but nothing was done about it that evening. They agreed to meet at a tavern the next evening, and on that occasion Kerling joined them for awhile. Cramer had known Kerling in this country and knew he had returned to Germany. Thiel entrusted his money to Cramer for safe-keeping, but asked him not to put all of it in a safe-deposit box, since he might need it "in a hurry." Thiel was arrested after leaving Cramer. Cramer took Thiel's money home, secreted some of it, and put the rest in his bank. Cramer was arrested and after some unsuccessful lying he admitted that he felt sure that Thiel had come from Germany by submarine on a mission for the German government and that he thought the mission was "to stir up unrest among the people and probably spread propaganda."

After the case had been twice argued, the Court, dividing five-to-four, held that there was not sufficient proof of the crime of treason as defined by the Constitution. Mr. Justice Jackson wrote the majority opinion. The Constitution states: "Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court." The history of the law of treason in England and in this country shows that this rigidly limited provision in the Constitution was put there by men who "were taught by experience and by history to fear abuse of the treason charge almost as much as they feared treason itself." They were guarding against two dangers: "(1) perversion by established authority to repress peaceful political opposition; and (2) conviction of the innocent as a result of perjury, passion, or inadequate evidence." A treason conviction, in short, must rest on two elements, treasonable intent, and overt acts in pursuance of that intent proved by the evidence of two witnesses. The Court made the following points. First, the treasonable intent, or "adherence to the enemy," necessary to spell out treason, need not be proved by the evidence of two witnesses. It may

be reasonably inferred from overt acts, and certain kinds of overt acts are in themselves evidence of treasonable intent. Second, the overt acts necessary to the crime of treason must, however, be such as to sustain a finding that the accused gave aid and comfort to the enemy. Third, the overt acts charged against Cramer, and supported by two-witness proof, comprised merely his meeting with Thiel and Kerling at the times and places above stated, their drinking together, and their holding long and earnest conversations. There was no evidence of what they talked about. "Cramer furnished them no shelter, nothing that can be called sustenance or support, and there is no evidence that he gave them encouragement or counsel, or even paid for their drinks." These overt acts do not amount to giving aid and comfort to the enemy. The contention of government counsel that "little imagination is required to perceive the advantage such meeting would afford to enemy spies not yet detected" is met by Mr. Justice Jackson's comment that "the difficulty with this argument is that the whole purpose of the constitutional provision is to make sure that treason conviction shall rest on direct proof of two witnesses and not on even a little imagination." Fourth, the government did not present to the jury the overt acts attributed to Cramer in connection with his taking of Thiel's money for safe-keeping. Knowledge of this came exclusively from Cramer's own statements while on the stand, and the government appears to have recognized either that the statement could not be regarded as "a confession in open court" or that the statement lacked two-witness proof. Had these overt acts been properly established, the result might have been very different, since they did give aid and comfort to the enemy. Fifth, the Court answered the charge that its rigid construction of the treason clause prevents the government "from adequately combating the techniques of modern warfare," by stating that Congress has full power to forbid many acts short of treason which imperil our wartime safety, and implied strongly that other and lesser charges might perhaps have been made and sustained against Cramer.

Mr. Justice Douglas wrote a dissenting opinion in which the Chief Justice and Justices Black and Reed concurred. He attacked what he regarded as the ultra-rigid test applied by the Court to the nature of the overt acts necessary to spell out treason, and urged that Cramer's meeting with the two saboteurs was, under the circumstances, an overt act of treason. He also protested against the exclusion of the evidence given by Cramer relating to his voluntary safeguarding of the saboteur's money.

2. NATIONAL POWER AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Two important cases involving civil liberties turned strictly upon the construction of federal statutes. They belong, however, in a constitutional law context since a different statutory interpretation in each case might easily have posed a major constitutional problem.

The Deportation of Harry Bridges. In Bridges v. Wixon,[6] a divided Court set aside as unlawful the deportation order against Harry Bridges. This case, which had been a *cause celèbre* for a decade, intimately concerns the civil liberties of aliens. The facts are as follows. Harry Bridges came to this country from Australia in 1920. He was a longshoreman, and he became active in the labor union movement on the West Coast. He became head of the International Longshoremen's Association (an A. F. of L. union) and led the maritime workers' strike on the Pacific Coast in 1934. In 1937, this union broke with the A. F. of L. and joined the C.I.O. under the new name of International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. Bridges has been head of this union on the Pacific Coast ever since, and holds important offices in the C.I.O. In 1934 and 1935, the Immigration and Naturalization Service investigated Bridges with a view to determining if he was liable to deportation, but found not even "a shred of evidence" to support such action. In 1938, fresh deportation proceedings were started on the ground that Bridges had been and then was a member of or affiliated with the Communist party of the United States, and that that party advocated and taught the overthrow by force of the government of the United States. At that time, the statute dealing with deportation, as construed in Kessler v. Strecker,[7] required a showing of present membership in the Communist party to support deportation. Past membership was not sufficient. A hearing was had before Dean James M. Landis, of the Harvard Law School, as a special examiner, who concluded that the evidence showed that Bridges was neither affiliated with nor a member of the Communist party. The Secretary of Labor sustained the examiner and dismissed the proceedings in January, 1940. Resentment against Bridges in certain quarters was sufficient to lead the House of Representatives thereupon to pass a special bill directing the Attorney General, "notwithstanding any other provisions of law," immediately to deport Bridges, "whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful" (H.R. 9766, 76th Cong., 3d. Sess.). The Attorney General protested that this bill was inconsistent with the American practice and tradition of due process of law, and it died in a Senate committee. Congress, however, in passing the Alien Registration Act of June 28, 1940, amended the statute relating to the deportation of aliens by authorizing the deportation of any alien who was "at the time of entering the United States, or has been at any time thereafter," a member of or affiliated with an organization that believes in or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United States. This amendment set aside the ruling in Kessler v. Strecker. Action to deport Bridges was started under the new statute on the ground that at an earlier date he had been a member of or affiliated with the Communist party. A new hearing was held before

[6] 326 U.S. 135, 1945.

[7] 307 U.S. 22, 1939. See this REVIEW, Vol. 34, p. 269.

a special examiner, Judge Charles B. Sears, recently retired from the New York Court of Appeals. Judge Sears found that the Communist party did advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence, that the Marine Workers Industrial Union was affiliated with the Communist party and was an organization of the same character, and that Bridges, after entering this country, had been affiliated with both organizations and had been a member of the Communist party. He recommended deportation. The Board of Immigration Appeals reviewed these findings and concluded that Bridges had not been affiliated with or a member of either organization. The Attorney General reviewed the Board's decision, agreed with Judge Sears, and ordered Bridges deported. Bridges, having surrendered to the immigration officers, attacked the legality of his detention by seeking *habeas corpus*. The District Court, and later the Circuit Court of Appeals, sustained the deportation order and the Supreme Court took the case on certiorari.

In a five-to-three decision, Mr. Justice Jackson not participating, the Court held the deportation order against Bridges void. In his opinion for the majority, Mr. Justice Douglas, by-passing the constitutional questions urged on the Court, confined himself to the two grounds on which the deportation order rested. The first was that Bridges had been "affiliated" with the Communist party. The deportation statute stated that "the giving, loaning, or promising of money or anything of value to any organization, association, society, or group of the character above described [advocating or teaching violent overthrow of government] shall constitute affiliation therewith," but it went on to say that this is not to be taken as "an exclusive definition." The Court proceeded, therefore, to expound the term "affiliation." It said that "it imports . . . less than membership but more than sympathy." Generally speaking, a man who worked with and helped finance the Communist party would be affiliated with it. But here the Court injected a reservation of controlling importance, i.e., "but he who coöperates with such an organization only in its *wholly lawful activities* cannot by that fact be said as a matter of law to be 'affiliated' with it. . . . Alliances for limited objectives are well-known. Certainly those who joined forces with Russia to defeat the Nazis may not be said to have made an alliance to spread the cause of Communism. . . . A different result is not necessarily indicated if aid is given to or received from a proscribed organization in order to win a legitimate objective in a domestic controversy." It follows that one is "affiliated" with the Communist party only if he coöperates with it in order to further its proscribed purposes and objectives. The record presented no evidence that Bridges was "affiliated" in this restricted sense with the Communist party, or with any other organization which advocated the overthrow of government by force or violence. He coöperated with various Communist

groups "for the attainment of wholly lawful objectives." He accepted the aid and assistance of these revolutionary groups "to improve the lot of the workingmen on the waterfront. That he enlisted such aid is not denied. He justified that course on the grounds of expediency—to get such help as he could to aid the cause of his union." The finding that Bridges was "affiliated" with the Communistic groups was based, therefore, on too loose a meaning of the term.

The second ground for deportation was Bridges' alleged membership in the Communist party. The evidence supporting this charge was the testimony of two government witnesses, O'Niel and Lundeberg, which was lumped together by the Attorney General to reach a conclusion based on their "total weight," that Bridges had in fact joined the party. The testimony of O'Neil, however, was in the form of unsworn and unsigned statements which were read into the record in violation of a regulation of the Immigration and Naturalization Service requiring all such statements to be taken down in writing and signed by the witness after he has been sworn. This procedural defect destroyed the government's case on the question of Bridges' membership in the Communist party. The Court recognized "that deportation is not technically a criminal proceeding," but it observed: "That deportation is a penalty—at times a most serious one—cannot be doubted. Meticulous care must be exercised lest the procedure by which he [the alien] is deprived of that liberty [to remain here] not meet the essential standards of fairness."

In a concurring opinion, Mr. Justice Murphy asserted that "the Constitution has been more than a silent, anemic witness to this proceeding," and vigorously argued that the deportation statute is unconstitutional, first, because it denies due process by imposing punishment based on "guilt by association" rather than personal guilt, and secondly, because it does not meet the "clear and present danger" test applicable to freedom of speech and press.

Chief Justice Stone, with Justices Roberts and Frankfurter concurring, dissented on the ground that the Court was not authorized to determine the weight and credibility of the evidence against Bridges, but merely to decide whether there was "more than a scintilla" of evidence to support the findings of the administrative officers. The record clearly disclosed such evidence, and the deportation order was therefore valid.

Federal Statutory Protection of Civil Liberty—The Police Brutality Case. The case of Screws v. United States[8] involved the legality of an enterprising effort by the Department of Justice to extend the practical frontiers of the federal protection of civil rights by prosecuting state police officers whose brutal treatment of a Negro prisoner resulted in his death. The facts of the case are gruesome in the extreme. Screws was sheriff in a

[8] 325 U.S. 91, 1945.

county in Georgia. Aided by a deputy sheriff and a policeman, he arrested Hall, a Negro, late one night for the alleged theft of a tire. There was evidence that Screws held a grudge against Hall and had threatened to "get" him. The three officers handcuffed Hall, brought him to the court-house, and there proceeded to beat him with their fists and a two-pound blackjack until he was unconscious. He was dragged by the feet into the jail and thrown on the floor and died an hour later in a hospital. An unsuccessful effort was made to persuade the state of Georgia to prosecute the three officers. When this failed, the United States Attorney, with the approval and active aid of the Department of Justice (the Civil Rights Section) indicted and convicted Screws and the other two officers of violation of Section 20 of the federal Criminal Code. This section, part of the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870, reads as follows:

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

The indictment rested on the theory that the three officers had deprived Hall, under color of the law of Georgia, of rights guaranteed to him by the Fourteenth Amendment, namely, "the right not to be deprived of life without due process of law; the right to be tried, upon the charge on which he was arrested, by due process of law, and if found guilty to be punished in accordance with the laws of Georgia."

The Court's disposition of the case is a masterpiece of confusion. Having held the case seven months after hearing argument, the justices produced four separate opinions running to over 25,000 words, in no one of which, however, did more than four justices concur. Five justices did agree that Screws was entitled to a new trial because the trial judge did not correctly charge the jury. (This trial has since occurred and the defendants were acquitted.) The leading opinion, written by Mr. Justice Douglas, dealt with three points. First, is the criminal charge here, that of violating the rights of a citizen which are protected in the Fourteenth Amendment, so vague as to violate due process of law. It was argued that Section 20 did not set up "an ascertainable standard of guilt." Can a state law-enforcement officer possibly know what rights are guaranteed to citizens by the Fourteenth Amendment and other clauses of the Constitution? This point is met by stressing the fact that the crime created by Section 20 is the "willful" deprivation of the citizen's rights, and Mr. Justice Douglas attempts, without conspicuous success, to make clear just what

is meant by "willful" in this context. Since the trial judge did not charge the jury on this point of the willfulness of the defendants' action, the conviction is set aside and a new trial ordered. Second, it is held that Screws did act under "color of law" in committing this crime. The idea is rejected that an officer acts "under color of law" only when performing duties expressly authorized by statute. The term means "under pretence of law," and the doctrine stated in United States v. Classic[9] is reaffirmed: "misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of state law, is action taken 'under color of' state law." Third, while the responsibility for the enforcement of criminal justice rests chiefly with the state, there is no constitutional barrier which prevents Congress from punishing a state officer who deprives a person of a right secured to him by the Constitution or by federal statute. To do so does not upset the proper balance between state and federal power.

Mr. Justice Rutledge concurred with the Douglas opinion in order to permit a disposition of the case by a majority of the Court, although he stated that but for this reason he would have gone along with Mr. Justice Murphy in upholding the conviction of Screws. Mr. Justice Murphy, in a short and clear-cut opinion, urged that Section 20 clearly applies to this case and that Screws was properly convicted. A dissenting opinion states the views of Justices Roberts, Frankfurter, and Jackson. It takes sharp issue with the Douglas opinion on each of the three points referred to above and concludes that the conviction should have been set aside.

While the Screws case leaves intact a certain quantum of federal power to proceed against state officials under Section 20 of the Criminal Code, the Department of Justice will hardly be able to move with confidence and vigor in the prosecution of future cases of this type, in view of the confusion and uncertainty which characterize the Court's disposition of the case.

3. STATUTORY INTERPRETATION

The Associated Press and the Sherman Act. Nation-wide attention was drawn to the Court's decision in Associated Press v. United States,[10] enjoining the enforcement of certain by-laws of the Associated Press because they violated the Sherman Act. The issue in the case had been dramatized by the inability of Mr. Marshall Field's recently established newspaper, the *Chicago Sun*, to secure AP membership. The relevant facts are as follows. The AP is a coöperative association incorporated in New York. It has some 1,200 newspaper members and its business is the collection, assembly, and distribution of news. It is financed by an assessment plan

[9] 313 U.S. 299, 1941. See this REVIEW, Vol. 36, p. 269.
[10] 326 U.S. 1, 1945.

which contemplates no profit to AP. The by-laws prohibited all AP members from selling news to any non-members and set up rules by which membership could be acquired. It was made easy for a paper which does not compete with an AP member to join. But when an applicant for membership would compete with an old AP member, its chances of admission were very slim. In such case, the applicant's member competitor could object to the admission. Over this objection, the applicant paper could gain membership only by a vote of a majority of all AP members, by relinquishing to its AP competitor any exclusive news or news picture rights it might have, and by paying to AP ten per cent of "the total amount of the regular assessments received by it from old members in the same competitive field during the entire period from October 1, 1900," to the date of admission. Thus to secure AP privileges in the morning field in Chicago at the time of this suit would cost $416,631.90 and in the evening field, $595,772.31.

A divided Court found these restrictive arrangements to be restraints of trade forbidden by the Sherman Act. Mr. Justice Black wrote the principal opinion. He alluded to the well-established doctrine that AP is engaged in interstate commerce and that its activities are not placed beyond the reach of the Sherman Act because they are coöperative rather than strictly commercial. It was argued that the AP regulations did no more than reserve to the members the products of their own enterprise and ingenuity. This might protect a single newspaper in a policy of exclusion, but the Sherman Act was specifically designed to prevent independent businesses from combining in a common plan "to reduce their competitors' opportunity to buy or sell the things in which the groups compete." Nor is the AP immune from the prohibitions of the act because its services are not "indispensable." The statute justifies no such test of "indispensability." It is pointed out that "by the restrictive by-laws each of the publishers in the combination has, in effect, surrendered himself completely to the control of the association in respect to the disposition of news in interstate commerce." To forbid this is not to convert a newspaper into a public utility, with an obligation of common service, but merely to hold that "arrangements or combinations designed to stifle competition cannot be immunized by adopting a membership device accomplishing that purpose." Finally, the opinion rejects the argument that to apply the Sherman Act to the AP abridges the freedom of the press guaranteed by the First Amendment. There is no applicability here of the "clear and present danger" test which the courts have used to protect the freedom to speak, write, and publish. The clear and present danger doctrine provides "no shield for business publishers who engaged in business practices condemned by the Sherman Act." Furthermore, "freedom to publish is guaranteed by the Constitution, but freedom to combine to

keep others from publishing is not." The Court, therefore, affirmed the decree of the lower court enjoining the continued enforcement by AP of its present restrictions on applications for membership.

In a concurring opinion, Mr. Justice Douglas emphasized that the decision does not direct AP to serve all applicants, but merely to cease discriminating against competitors of its members in the same field or territory. A concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter emphasized the peculiar interest which the public has in newspapers and concluded that the AP by-laws are not merely restraints on commerce but also "offend the basic functions which a constitutionally guaranteed free press serves in our nation." Mr. Justice Roberts dissented in an opinion in which Chief Justice Stone concurred, and Mr. Justice Murphy dissented separately.

Statutory Ban on Discrimination by Labor Unions against Racial and Other Minorities. The Railway Labor Act of 1934 provides: "Employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. The majority of any craft or class of employees shall have the right to determine who shall be the representative of the craft or class for the purposes of this act." Under these provisions, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen became the exclusive bargaining representative of the craft of firemen employed by numerous railroads. The Brotherhood excludes Negroes from membership. In 1940 and 1941, the Brotherhood negotiated new collective bargaining agreements with twenty-odd railroads in the southeastern part of the country. These agreements had the purpose and ultimate effect of excluding all Negroes from employment as firemen, and sacrificed certain seniority rights of Negro firemen which had already accrued. These agreements were made without the knowledge of the Negro firemen. In Steele v. Louisville & Nashville R. Co.,[11] a unanimous Court, speaking through Chief Justice Stone, upheld the right of Steele and other Negro firemen to an injunction restraining the enforcement of the agreement discriminating against them. This decision was grounded on the Court's construction of the Railway Labor Act, and not on constitutional grounds. This reasoning runs as follows. The statutory status of the Brotherhood, as the "representative" of the entire craft, imposed the duty to act on behalf of all the members of the craft. This representation is "for the purposes of the act," which is the avoidance of interruption of railroad service. If the interests of minorities in the craft are not represented by the Brotherhood, their only recourse will be to strike and the purpose of the act will be defeated. "We think that the Railway Labor Act imposes upon the statutory representatives of a craft at least as exacting a duty to protect equally the interests of the members of the craft as the Constitution imposes upon the legislature to give equal protection to the inter-

[11] 323 U.S. 192, 1944.

ests of those for whom it legislates." While the bargaining representatives may properly negotiate contracts which contain variations in terms based on relevant differences, such as seniority, degrees of skill, etc., it may not make race alone a basis of discrimination. Such discrimination is "irrelevant and invidious," and is plainly not authorized by the statute. Since the petitioners have no administrative remedy under which they may assert their rights in this case, injunction is the proper remedy. Mr. Justice Murphy, concurring, urged that the decision should have been grounded on the clear invasion of the constitutional rights of the Negro fireman. The Steele case was followed in Tunstall v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen,[12] in which there was no diversity of citizenship between the parties to the suit, but in which the Court held that the case arose under a law regulating commerce and that federal courts therefore had jurisdiction.

The basic doctrine of the Steele case was applied in a five-to-four decision in Wallace Corporation v. N.L.R.B.,[13] to ban as an unfair labor practice the making by an employer of a closed shop agreement with a labor union, acting as the accredited bargaining representative of the employees, when it is known to be the purpose of the majority union to deny membership to minority members because they belong to a rival union. This was an attack upon the C.I.O. The majority union, called "Independent," planned, after making the closed shop contract, to oust C.I.O. employees from their jobs. The Court stressed again the statutory duty of the bargaining representatives to serve as the agent of all employees "fairly and impartially." The dissenting justices rejected the statutory construction relied on by the majority, since the National Labor Relations Act expressly permits a closed shop.

Labor Unions and the Sherman Act. In Hunt v. Crumboch,[14] the Court held in a five-to-four opinion by Mr. Justice Black that a labor union does not violate the Sherman Act because it refuses to admit to membership the employees of a trucking company engaged in interstate commerce, and by closed shop agreements with its competitors drives the company out of business. However, in Allen Bradley Co. v. Local Union No. 3,[15] the Court held that a union did violate the Sherman Act when it combined with its employers and with the manufacturers of goods to restrain competition in, and monopolize the marketing of, such goods. Here an electrical workers' union had made closed-shop agreements with the makers and sellers of electrical equipment in metropolitan New York which made it completely impossible for competitors to break into this market. "We think Congress never intended that unions could, consistent with the

[12] 323 U.S. 210, 1944.
[13] 323 U.S. 248, 1944.
[14] 325 U.S. 821, 1945.
[15] 325 U.S. 797, 1945.

Sherman Act, aid non-labor groups to create business monopolies and to control the marketing of goods and services."

The Fair Labor Standards Act. Three cases arose under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot,[16] the Court held the child labor provision of the act inapplicable to the children employed by the company as messenger boys. The statute forbids any producer, manufacturer, or dealer to ship in commerce any goods produced in an establishment in which child labor is employed. While telegraphic messages are "subjects of commerce" and hence "goods" within the meaning of the act, the Court concluded that the company does not "produce" these telegraphic messages, nor does it "ship" them in the sense in which the word "ship" is commonly used. In Gemsco, Inc. v. Walling,[17] it is held that the Fair Labor Standards Act authorizes the prohibition of industrial homework when this is necessary in order to make effective a minimum wage order for an industry. In Jewell Ridge Coal Corporation v. Local No. 6167, U.M.W.,[18] the Court, following an earlier ruling made in the iron-mining industry, held that under the Fair Labor Standards Act bituminous coal miners were entitled to be paid for the time spent "traveling from the portals to their usual places of work and return." This "portal-to-portal pay" issue had loomed large in the dispute in the coal industry which had created a serious threat of a strike.

Campaign Expenditures as Deductions from Taxable Income. In McDonald v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue,[19] the Court, with four justices dissenting, held that a candidate for public office could not deduct from his taxable income in computing his federal income tax the expenses incurred by him in his election campaign. McDonald, who had been appointed by the governor of Pennsylvania to fill an unexpired term as judge of a common pleas court, later sought election to the office for a full term of ten years. To secure the support of his party organization, he was required to pay an "assessment" of $8,000 into the party campaign fund, and he spent over $5,000 on his own personal campaign. He deducted $13,000 as a "reëlection expense," and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the majority, held that the deduction was not permissible under the section of the Revenue Act which allows the deduction of "all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business." The campaign expenses "were not expenses incurred in being a judge, but in trying to be a judge for the next ten years." Nor is there merit in the petitioner's contention that, since he lost the election, his campaign expenses constitute a loss incurred in a "trans-

[16] 323 U.S. 490, 1945.
[17] 324 U.S. 244, 1945.
[18] 325 U.S. 161, 1945.
[19] 323 U.S. 57, 1944.

action entered into for profit" and therefore deductable under another section of the statute. "It suffices to say that the petitioner's money was not spent to buy the election, but to buy the opportunity to persuade the electors. His campaign contribution was not an insurance of victory frustrated by 'an act of God,' but the price paid for an active share in the hazards of popular elections." The majority concluded that Congress had shown no intention of including campaign expenses in the list of deductions from taxable income. Mr. Justice Black, with whom Justices Reed, Douglas and Murphy concurred, dissented on the ground that campaign expenses fall clearly within the reasonable meaning of the language used in the Revenue Act.

B. QUESTIONS OF STATE POWER

1. THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

Freedom of Speech and Due Process of Law—Immunity of Labor Union Organizers from State Restrictions. Beginning in 1943, a substantial number of states, many of them in the South, have passed statutes designed to regulate labor unions, and in varying degrees to curb their activities. It was inevitable that some of these would appear to clash either with the more liberal policies embodied in federal labor statutes or with constitutional prohibitions. Cases are moving to the Supreme Court in which the validity of these state laws is being questioned. Such a case is Thomas v. Collins,[20] involving a statute passed in Texas in 1943. This act required all labor union organizers operating in the state of Texas to secure from the secretary of state an organizer's card before soliciting any members for his organization. In order to secure the card, he was obliged to give his name, his union affiliations, and his credentials. The secretary of state had no discretion to refuse to register such an organizer if his application was properly made. The organizer was given a card which he was required to carry with him and to show to any person whom he solicited for membership. The act subjected labor unions to various requirements which were not brought to issue in this case. R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers and a vice-president of C.I.O., went to Texas after the passage of this act for the purpose of addressing a labor union meeting. The fact that Thomas was to speak was widely advertised well in advance. Thomas did not apply for registration as a labor organizer as required by the state statute, but proceeded to address a meeting of about 300 union men. In the course of his address he specifically invited any non-union persons present to join the union, and at the close of the meeting he specifically solicited membership of a particular person, named in the record. All this was done in order to permit a legal test of the validity

[20] 323 U.S. 516, 1945.

of the state requirement. Prior to the meeting, a restraining order had been served on Thomas, forbidding him to address the meeting in the capacity of an organizer since he had not registered, and he was subsequently cited for contempt for a deliberate and willful violation of the order.

Five justices produced three opinions holding the Texas statute invalid as an unreasonable interference with freedom of speech. The leading opinion was written by Mr. Justice Rutledge. He emphasized the fact that the meeting addressed by Thomas was entirely orderly and that the right of free assembly, as well as freedom of speech, was concerned in the case. He rejected the idea that the guarantee of freedom of speech cannot be applied to businesses or economic activities. It was admitted that there was no prior censorship of Thomas' speech, nor was any discretionary authority vested in any state officer to deny him the right to register as a labor union organizer. The opinion held, however, that the simple requirement of previous identification cannot validly be imposed upon one who wishes to exercise his right under the First Amendment. It would be unconstitutional to forbid Thomas to hold his meeting and make his speech, and it is therefore unconstitutional to punish him for not having previously registered as a condition of the privilege of doing so.

The Rutledge opinion is significant for the clear and unequivocal statement which it contains that the guarantees of the First Amendment—freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly, occupy preferred status in our scheme of constitutional values. Since this is true, no presumption of validity attaches to any legislation which on its face appears to infringe any of these guarantees. "Any attempt to restrict those liberties must be justified by a clear public interest, threatened not doubtfully or remotely, but by clear and present danger. The rational connection between the remedy provided and the evil to be curbed, which in other contexts might support legislation against attack on due process grounds, will not suffice. These rights rest on firmer foundations. Accordingly, whatever occasion would restrain orderly discussion and persuasion, at appropriate time and place, must have clear support in public danger, actual or impending. Only the gravest abuses, endangering paramount interests give occasion for permissible limitation. . . . " A majority of the Court did not agree that the statute conflicted with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and the decision rested, therefore, solely upon the constitutional point just discussed.

Mr. Justice Roberts, with whom the Chief Justice and Justices Reed and Frankfurter concurred, took the position that the registration requirement was a reasonable police regulation which did not interfere with freedom of speech, but merely required a paid labor union organizer to identify himself as such.

Religious Liberty and Due Process of Law—Exclusion of Conscientious Objectors from the Practice of Law. The Court's almost unbroken support of freedom of conscience in recent cases is withheld in *In re* Summers,[21] which sustained the right of Illinois to exclude a conscientious objector from admission to the bar. The law examiners of Illinois did not dispute Summers' general good character or professional fitness. They excluded him solely because his religious scruples against bearing arms "seem inconsistent with the obligation of an attorney at law." The precise ground of this ruling was that Summers could not in good faith take the oath which is required of Illinois lawyers to support the state constitution. This, in turn, was based on the fact that the Illinois constitution contains the clause: "The militia of the state of Illinois shall consist of all able-bodied male persons resident in the state, between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, except such persons as now are, or hereafter may be, exempted by the laws of the United States, or of this State." Summers was willing to take the required oath, but was not permitted to do so. Men have not been drafted into the Illinois militia since 1864, and no one suggested that such action in the future is probable. Thus Summers' status was roughly similar to that of Mrs. Schwimmer, a woman of fifty who was denied citizenship in 1929[22] because she would not, by reason of conscientious scruples, take an oath to bear arms in defense of the United States. Five justices, speaking through Mr. Justice Reed, held that Summers had not been denied due process of law by any state infringement of the freedom of religion protected by the First Amendment. The opinion granted that the state could not exclude the members of a particular religious sect as such from admission to the bar, but denied that there is such religious discrimination here. It alluded to the fact that such immunities as conscientious objectors enjoy under the Selective Training and Service Act stem from Congressional generosity rather than from constitutional right. Finally, the Court relied upon the Schwimmer case and the parallel Macintosh case,[23] in which conscientious objectors were denied citizenship, as fully supporting the Illinois action here. A vigorous dissent by Mr. Justice Black, with whom Justices Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge concurred, attacked the exclusion of Summers as a direct assault upon his freedom of religion, and expressed firm agreement with the views of the dissenting justices in the Schwimmer and Macintosh cases.

The Right of Accused Persons to Counsel. That the right of an accused

[21] 325 U.S. 561, 1945.

[22] United States v. Schwimmer, 279 U.S. 644, 1929. See this REVIEW, Vol. 24, p. 86.

[23] United States v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605, 1931. See this REVIEW, Vol. 26, p. 266.

person to be represented by counsel remains an important ingredient of due process of law was emphasized in three cases, in all of which the accused pleaded guilty. In Williams v. Kaiser,[24] conviction for a capital crime resulted from the defendant's plea of guilty entered after he had requested and had been refused the aid of counsel. He alleged that he was without funds to employ counsel, and after the court's failure to provide him with counsel he was "compelled to plead guilty." While granting that a conviction based on a plea of guilty is not lightly to be set aside, the Court emphasized that in a capital case the situation is different. "Only counsel could discern from the facts whether a plea of not guilty to the offense charged or a plea of guilty to a lesser offense would be appropriate." Refusal of counsel in such a case denies due process. A similar result was reached in House v. Mayo,[25] in which the accused pleaded guilty to a burglary charge after being refused by the Court a twenty-four hour delay in his trial to permit him to consult his attorney, who was away. In Rice v. Olson,[26] it was held that the accused who had pleaded guilty to a charge of burglary did not waive his right to counsel at the time of entering his plea because, through ignorance, he did not ask to have counsel assigned, and the trial court did not inform him of his constitutional rights in the matter.

Discrimination against Negroes. Akins v. Texas[27] held that a Negro was not denied the equal protection of the laws through racial discrimination by being indicted for murder by a grand jury on which only one Negro served. The Court has repeatedly held that a Negro is constitutionally entitled to be indicted and tried by juries from which Negroes have not been excluded because of their race.[28] It was further held that the failure of a community over a long period of time ever to call Negroes for jury service, although there are qualified Negroes available for such service, is evidence of such discrimination.[29] In 1942, the Court set aside the conviction of a Negro in a Texas county because it found he had been the victim of just this kind of racial discrimination (see Hill v. Texas).[30] The following year, Akins was indicted in this county, and the jury commissioners were careful to see that one Negro was placed on the panel of sixteen from which the grand jury of twelve was drawn, and this Negro also served on the grand jury which indicted Akins. Each of the three jury commissioners stated candidly: "I did not have any intention of placing more than one Negro on the panel." Do these facts spell racial discrimination? The Court held not. It failed to find "purposeful" discrimination.

[24] 323 U.S. 471. 1945.
[25] 324 U.S. 42, 1945.
[26] 324 U.S. 786, 1945.
[27] 325 U.S. 398, 1945.
[28] Strauder v. West Virginia, 100 U.S. 303, 1880.
[29] Norris v. Alabama, 294 U.S. 587, 1935. See this REVIEW, Vol. 30, p. 83.
[30] 316 U.S. 400, 1942. See this REVIEW, Vol. 37, p. 282.

The mere fact of inequality in the number selected does not in itself show discrimination. No race or group is entitled to proportional representation in the make-up of juries. In this particular county, fifteen per cent of the population were Negroes, and on a strict mathematical computation a Negro would be entitled to 1.8552 Negro members on a jury of twelve. The presence of only one Negro, therefore, does not prove racial discrimination.

Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Black dissented. Mr. Justice Murphy wrote a sharp dissent declaring: "Clearer proof of intentional and deliberate limitation on the basis of color would be difficult to produce."

In Railway Mail Association v. Corsi,[31] an unsuccessful effort was made by the organized postal clerks of the United States Railway Mail Service (an A. F. of L. affiliate) to secure immunity from the section of the New York Civil Rights Law which forbids any labor organization in the state to deny any person membership or equal privileges because of race, color, or creed. The due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is not violated by this statute, since there is no arbitrary abridgement of property rights or liberty of contract. Nor is there denial of equal protection, because while the state regulates membership in an organization of government employees, it does not extend to them the customary privileges of collective bargaining. The state statute in no way conflicts with any federal interest under the postal power. There is no interference with the mail service, and no burden on the government.

C. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

The long-established doctrine that property owned by the United States is immune from state taxation was reaffirmed in Cleveland v. United States.[32] Cleveland, and the county in which it lies, sought to collect their customary real estate taxes on the lands within their limits which had been acquired by condemnation by the Federal Public Housing Authority and on which federal low-cost housing projects were being developed. A unanimous Court rejected the argument that Congress has no power to establish low-cost housing projects, since such projects clearly promote the general welfare by relieving unemployment and safeguarding the "health, safety, and morals of the Nation's citizens by improving housing conditions." The immunity of this federal property from state taxation "is settled by such an array of authority that citation would seem to be unnecessary."

The case of Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt[33] led the Court to consider with care the applicability of the well-known original package rule an-

[31] 326 U.S. 88, 1945.
[32] 323 U.S. 329, 1945.
[33] 324 U.S. 652, 1945.

nounced in Brown v. Maryland[34] in 1827 to certain bales of hemp brought from the Philippine Islands and other places outside the country, and stored in their original packages in the petitioners' warehouses preliminary to their use in the manufacture of rope. Chief Justice Stone, speaking for a divided Court, rejected the three grounds upon which the state authorities asserted their right to impose non-discriminatory property taxes upon these bales. First, the petitioner was held to be the importer of the goods even though under the contracts which led to the importation the actual sale, or passing of title, did not occur until the goods had arrived in this country. Second, the act of storing the bales in a warehouse pending their use in manufacturing operations does not deprive them of their character as imports as long as they remain in the original packages. The goods cease to be imports when they are actually used in manufacturing, but not until then. "We do not perceive upon what grounds it can be thought that imports for manufacture lose their character as imports any sooner or more readily than imports for sale." Third, the bales brought from the Philippine Islands are "imports" in the constitutional sense. An import is a commodity which is brought "from without the country." It is not necessary that it come from a "foreign" country. Goods from the Philippines came from without the country.

Mr. Justice Reed dissented from the Court's ruling that goods from the Philippines are imports. Mr. Justice Black, with whom Justices Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge joined, dissented on the ground that the storage of the goods pending later processing deprived them of their character as imports. Mr. Justice Murphy, however, agreed with the Chief Justice that goods coming from the Philippines are imports.

In Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona,[35] the Court held invalid a state statute which made it unlawful to operate within the state a railroad train of more than fourteen passenger cars or seventy freight cars. Congress has not legislated on the matter of the length of trains in interstate commerce. However, the findings in the record "show that the operation of long trains, that is, trains of more than fourteen passenger and more than seventy freight cars, is standard practice over the main lines of the railroads of the United States, and that, if the length of trains is to be regulated at all, national uniformity in the regulation adopted, such as only Congress can prescribe, is practically indispensable to the operation of an efficient and economical national railway system." Thus the case is governed by the familiar rule of Cooley v. Board of Port Wardens.[36]

In Hill v. Florida,[37] a Florida statute was held invalid on the ground of conflict with the National Labor Relations Act. This statute required

[34] 12 Wheaton 419, 1827.
[35] 325 U.S. 761, 1945.
[36] 12 Howard 299, 1852.
[37] 325 U.S. 538, 1945.

every person serving as a business agent for a labor union to procure a state license before acting in such capacity. To procure the license, he must show that he has been a citizen of the United States for more than ten years, has never been convicted of felony, and is a person of good moral character. The license could then be issued by a special board created for the purpose, not as a routine matter, but in the exercise of its discretion in determining whether the applicant met the standards imposed by the act. Various requirements not here involved were also imposed by the statute upon labor unions. Hill violated the law by refusing to procure a license, and an injunction was issued to restrain his further activity as a labor union agent. In a brief opinion by Mr. Justice Black, the Court pointed out that the Wagner Act, both in its history and in its provisions, places peculiarly strong emphasis upon the complete freedom of labor organizations to choose those who shall represent them in collective bargaining. The Florida statute limits this full freedom of choice and is, therefore, in direct conflict with the federal act. Justices Frankfurter and Roberts dissented.

D. INTERSTATE RELATIONS

Full Faith and Credit as Applied to Divorces. It will be recalled that in 1942 the Court held, in the case of Williams v. North Carolina,[38] that the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution required North Carolina to recognize the validity of Nevada divorces granted to a man and wife who had left North Carolina and gone to Nevada in order to secure the divorce, even though the two defendant spouses had neither been served with summons nor put in an appearance. In this case the two divorced persons remarried in Nevada and returned to North Carolina, where they were prosecuted for bigamous cohabitation. This case left open the important question whether North Carolina could refuse recognition to the Nevada divorce, not on the ground just mentioned, but on the ground that the courts of Nevada did not have jurisdiction over the parties because of the inadequate and fraudulent character of their domicile in Nevada. This question was raised in Williams v. North Carolina,[39] and a majority of the Court, in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, held that under the facts disclosed by the record, North Carolina was justified in concluding that Nevada did not have jurisdiction over the parties, and could not therefore issue a decree of divorce which North Carolina was bound to respect. It sustained the conviction of Mr. and Mrs. Williams on the criminal charge already mentioned. The opinion emphasized that the obligation of the states of the Union to accord full

[38] 317 U.S. 287, 1942. See this REVIEW, Vol. 38, p. 287.
[39] 325 U.S. 226, 1945.

faith and credit to a judicial decree of any other state arises only if that state had jurisdiction to issue the decree. The question whether this jurisdiction does or does not exist cannot be conclusively settled by the state court asserting the jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is subject to impeachment in the Supreme Court. Since this is true, the existence of bona fide domicile in Nevada became the decisive issue in this case, and the Court agreed with the North Carolina court that there was no such domicile. The record showed that the petitioners, long-time residents of North Carolina, went to Nevada, where they stayed at an auto court for transients, filed suits for divorce as soon as the Nevada law permitted, married one another as soon as the divorces were obtained, and promptly returned to North Carolina to live. Under these circumstances, North Carolina was fully entitled to draw the inference that Williams and his wife had never abandoned their domiciles in North Carolina and were therefore not lawfully divorced by the Nevada decree.

A concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Murphy, joined by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Jackson, registered a marked degree of sympathy for the unfortunate couple now finally convicted of crime "for acts which they probably committed in reliance upon advice of counsel and without intent to violate the North Carolina statute." In the case of Justices Rutledge, Black, and Douglas, however, this concern for the rights of the convicted man and wife led to a vigorous dissent. Mr. Justice Black urged that the conviction denies due process of law, since criminality is imposed on grounds which could not have been foreseen by those who were punished. Ignorance of the law excuses no man; "it is quite a different thing, however, to sentence people to prison for lacking the clairvoyant gift of prophesying when one judge or jury will upset the findings of fact made by another."

It is generally agreed that the first Williams case injected a degree of confusion into the legal status of out-of-state divorces. It is not easy to see that the second Williams case has done much to clear up that confusion. There can be little doubt that if the doctrine of this case is rigidly adhered to and aggressively enforced, a good many thousand people who have secured Nevada divorces and subsequently remarried are presently liable to criminal prosecution.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

THE FIRST SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

(January 3–December 21, 1945)

FLOYD M. RIDDICK

Editor, "Governmental Affairs," U. S. Chamber of Commerce

The death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, followed by the termination of World War II, were the two events of the year having the most direct influence on Congressional activity.

The strained relation between Mr. Roosevelt and Congress had been growing increasingly tense during the last several years; it is probable that only the defense program eliminated the possibility of a complete break between the two arms of the government. Congress had been rejecting more and more items of the President's domestic program.

Better relations between the President and Congress, however, were attained overnight with the arrival of Harry S. Truman at the White House. Even sentiment for Congressional reform appeared to diminish simultaneously; at least, conversations on Capitol Hill pointed to this conclusion. The new happy status seemed like a rebirth, but only for a short period; by autumn, Congress began to disagree openly with President Truman and his attempt to direct the legislative program.[1]

The termination of the war also had a tremendous effect on the nature of legislation enacted. During the war much legislation had been passed in the name of national defense which otherwise would never have been approved. Congress, too, stayed action on several proposals which finally became law only when it was publicly established that the legislation was deemed essential for the winning of the war. There was endless conflict over a few issues, but growing out of differences of opinion as to what was necessary for the government to undertake in order to win the war. There was, for example, a fight over the so-called manpower legislation, which finally led to a deadlock[2] without enactment.

As soon as hostilities ceased, however, Congress began to change its attitude as to the need for much of the so-called emergency legislation. In the last few months, much sentiment was expressed in the House and Senate in opposition to Congress continuing many of the emergency controls authorized during the war. Final decisions, however, were left to the Second Session.

Organization. The political complexion of the House and Senate of the Seventy-ninth Congress, First Session, changed little as compared with

[1] See below, "Congress and the President."

[2] See action on H.R. 1752.

that of the Seventy-eighth Congress.[3] In the Senate at the beginning of the session, the party ratio remained the same, but by March 19 the Republicans had gained until that party had its largest representation since 1933, with 40 Republicans, 55 Democrats, and 1 Progressive.[4] In the House, the Democrats picked up 21 Representatives, while the Republicans lost 19 seats, and other parties lost 2, but with a total change in personnel of 79. The chairmanships of four[5] standing committees of the

TABLE I

HOUSE AND SENATE LEADERSHIP

Office	*Democratic*		*Republican*	
	Senate	*House*	*Senate*	*House*
Vice President Speaker	Truman[6] (Mo.)	Rayburn (Tex.)		
President Pro Tempore	McKellar (Tenn.)			
Floor Leaders	Barkley (Ky.)	McCormack (Mass.)	White (Me.)	Martin (Mass.)
Whips	Hill (Ala.)	Ramspeck (Ga.)	Wherry (Nebr.)	Arends (Ill.)
Chairmen of Caucuses	Barkley (Ky.)	Doughton (N.C.)	Vandenberg (Mich.)	Woodruff (Mich.)
Steering Committee Chairmen	Barkley (Ky.)	Crosser (Ohio)	No committee	Hope (Kans.)
Chairmen of Committee on Committees	(Steering Committee Serves in this capacity.)	Doughton (N.C.)	White (Me.)	Martin (Mass.)

[3] See this REVIEW, Vol. 38, p. 302 (Apr., 1944). The party division at the beginning of the Seventy-eighth Congress was as follows: in the Senate, 57 Dem., 38 Rep., 1 other; in the House, 243 Dem., 190 Rep., 2 others.

[4] See *Official List of Members of House of Representatives*, Oct. 29, 1945, Seventy-ninth Congress, pp. 12–13, 15.

[5] The four changes in standing committee chairmanships in the Senate were: Murray to the chairmanship of Education and Labor; Stewart, Interoceanic Canals; Thomas (Utah), Military Affairs; and Andrews, Public Buildings and Grounds.

[6] Truman became President at the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt April 12, 1945, at which time McKellar became the presiding officer of the Senate.

Senate and 12[7] of the House were changed at the beginning or during the session.

The changes mentioned affected the continuity in the leadership of the two chambers very little. Moreover, the political officers in the House and the Senate around which the organizations of the two parties were built changed little from those of the preceding Congress, and were as shown in the table above.

Procedure—General Aspects. The procedure in the House and the Senate was not unusual. As had been the case since World War II began, the session dragged out over an entire calendar year, from January 3 until December 21. The House adjourned for a short summer recess from July 21 to September 5, while the Senate was out of session from August 1 until September 5, having worked longer than the House in order to dispose of the United Nations Charter.[8]

During the session, the activities of the two bodies were rather varied. Several joint sessions were held to receive returning war heroes. The House and Senate were in session 205 and 169 days, respectively, over a period of 353 calendar days. The proceedings printed out 12,722 pages of the *Record* as compared with 9,940 and 11,116 pages respectively of the second and first sessions of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Of the 12,722 pages, the House proceedings accounted for 6,760 and the Senate proceedings for 5,960.[9]

The following table of bills debated by the House and Senate for more than three pages each of the *Congressional Record* (from Jan. 3, 1941, to Dec. 31, 1945) is significant in estimating the actual legislative activity of the two bodies.

These data show in part that the war crisis placed a restraint on the amount of debate the Senate and the House devoted to the various issues

[7] The 12 changes in standing committee chairmanships in the House were: White to the chairmanship of Coinage, Weights and Measures; Bonner, Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress; Domengeaux, Elections #1; Fisher, Elections #3; Rogers, Enrolled Bills; Jackson, Indian Affairs; Murdock, Irrigation and Reclamation; Fernandez, Memorials; Somers, Mines and Mining; Peterson, Territories; Wood (also Hart), Un-American Activities; and Engel, War Claims.

[8] H.Con. Res. 68, an unusual adjournment resolution, provided that the House adjourn from July 21 to Oct. 8; it gave the consent of the House to an adjournment of the Senate at any time "during the month of August or September," 1945, until Oct. 8; and it authorized the President *pro tempore* of the Senate and the Speaker of the House or a combination of House and Senate officials to reassemble Congress for consideration of legislation if it were legislatively desirable. With the war out of the way, the day of convening was stepped up to September 5.

[9] Speeches and materials never delivered in the House, but incorporated in the *Record* under the privilege of "leave to print," involved some 6,244 pages of appendix, nearly half as many as the entire proceedings of both houses.

coming before them; the first session tabulated here accounts for Congressional activity before the war began and the last involves some proceedings after the war ended. Further, they disclose that of the 1,005 bills and resolutions passed by the Senate during this session, only 66 were controversial; the other 939 were passed with little or no discussion by a

TABLE II

BILLS DEBATED FOR THREE OR MORE PAGES OF RECORD

	77th Congress				*78th Congress*				*79th Congress*	
Pages Debated	*First Session 1941*		*Second Session 1942*		*First Session 1943*		*Second Session 1944*		*First Session 1945*	
	House	*Senate*	*House*	*Senate*	*House*	*Senate*	*House*	*Senate*	*House*	*Senate*
3– 5	7	10	20	13	10	10	9	4	7	4
5– 10	20	14	26	16	16	13	12	15	30	15
10– 15	24	9	10	5	24	11	12	4	15	13
15– 20	9	7	13	2	7	5	10	3	7	2
20– 25	15	7	5	5	3	5	10	1	12	5
25– 30	9	5	6	5	8	3	2	2	8	3
30– 35	8	2	3	1	3	2	4	0	10	3
35– 40	3	2	4	0	5	0	1	2	1	1
40– 45	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	6	0
45– 50	3	1	1	0	1	1	5	1	3	2
50– 60	2	0	5	4	5	5	5	1	4	4
60– 70	1	1	1	2	4	1	3	2	5	3
70– 80	5	1	0	1	3	1	4	1	1	1
80– 90	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
90–100	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	2
100–125	3	1	0	3	4	6	3	2	6	2
125–150	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	1	2
150–175	2	0	0	3	1	1	1	1	0	1
175–200	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
200–300	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	1	1
300–400	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
400–500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
500–600	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	116	67	102	63	101	68	86	47	120	66

voice vote or "without objection." Of the 1,184 bills and resolutions passed by the House, only 120 involved any debate. The others were passed by a voice vote or under unanimous consent procedure.

The measure debated at greatest length during the session was the bill providing for control of manpower (H.R. 1752), discussion of which took over ten days in the Senate and five in the House, involving over 386

pages of the *Record*. The extension of the trade agreements acts (H.R. 3240) was the second longest debated measure, involving some 371 pages of the *Record*.

Senate Procedure. The Senate procedure was much like that of the last several years, with the leadership for the majority practically unchanged. According to Senator George of Georgia, "the Honorable Alben W. Barkley, senior Senator from Kentucky, has served in the capacity of majority leader for a longer period of time than anyone else in the history of the Senate. . . ."[10] On Barkley's eighth anniversary as floor leader, the 28th of July, the Senate put business aside momentarily to congratulate and commend Senator Barkley for his long and able service. Senator George said of him: "Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished majority leader has at all times maintained the dignity of his political party in this body, but he likewise has approached the discharge of all his duties, as the President of the United States says, without 'semblance of partisanship or desire for party advantage whenever the welfare of our Nation required it'." Senator White, the minority leader, declared: "I have wondered many times how it was possible for him to master the intricacies of the many legislative subjects which come before the Senate; how he could discuss them with such force and such clarity as he has done. . . ."

The Senate had more to say about committee jurisdiction than has been its normal p. actice; in fact, that body was engaged several days in a discussion of to which committees particular bills should be referred. The reference of scientific research and atomic bomb bills, the Missouri Valley Authority measure, and a bill to amend the Civil Aëronautics Act was contested and decided by majority action after much debate.[11] Finally, in the case of the scientific research bills,[12] hearings were held jointly before subcommittees of the Senate Commerce Committee and the Committee on Military Affairs, because bills of a like nature were pending before both groups.[13] Many senators argued for the creation of new committees

[10] *Congressional Record*, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., daily edition, p. 8329, July 28, 1945 (hereafter cited as C.R., 79-1).

[11] See C.R., 79-1, pp. 2344 for March 16, p. 2044 for March 12, p. 9555 for October 4, and p. 9485 for October 3, 1945.

[12] Bill included S. 1248, S. 1285, and S. 1297.

[13] Note the following remarks by Senator Barkley during the discussion of reference of the atomic bomb bill: "That all depends. We cannot introduce a specific bill and have it referred to more than one committee Now and then the Senate has referred a bill to a particular committee, with an agreement that after that committee reports the bill it should then go to some other committee—a practice which, in my judgment, is a bad one, because it dissipates jurisdiction and authority. Frequently, bills which are introduced as a whole might, if introduced in separate parts, go to separate committees of the Senate. But the Chair and the Senate must decide the matter of the reference of a bill to a particular committee . . ." C.R., 79-1, pp. 9555, 9560.

to meet the new conditions, but the moves were all blocked, particularly at the insistence of Senator Barkley, and on the ground that the joint committee studying the organization of Congress had in mind curtailing the number of standing committees.

The Missouri Valley Authority bill was referred in pursuance of Senate Resolution 97, adopted on March 12, 1945.[14] This action required that the bill be referred to and reported by the Committees on Commerce, Irrigation and Reclamation, and Agriculture and Forestry, in the order listed, before the Senate would act on it; each committee was allowed sixty days in which to study the measure and make its report.[15]

The clôture rule was not invoked during the session, but on June 28, 1945, a petition was filed to speed action on H. R. 3368, War Agencies Appropriation Bill. The Southern senators were contesting funds for the Fair Employment Practice Committee, as provided in the bill. The petition was never called up, because a compromise was reached and the bill was passed two days later.[16]

As has been the case in the last several years, attendance in the Senate was poor, to the extent on several occasions of delaying the transaction of business. At one time, the Senate recessed from 1:15 p.m. until 2:30 p.m. in order to get a quorum.[17] Several times the sergeant-at-arms was ordered by the Senate to round up a quorum. On one occasion this action took place at approximately midnight.[18] On April 10, Senator Barkley practically lectured the membership because of its irresponsibility. He said:

"I do not know what has happened to the Senate of the United States. I regret to say what I am going to say, but it seems to me that it has reached an all-time peak in irresponsibility of attendance on the floor of the Senate. We can get but few Senators to come here while there is under consideration one of the most important matters that will be before the Senate in weeks, involving billions upon billions of dollars worth of property; and when the debate has been concluded Senators will come trooping in, asking somebody at the door what the Senate is voting on and how they should vote. It does not present a very encouraging picture of deliberation in the Senate of the United States."[19]

Attendance became so bad that the Senate leadership, as a remedy, prohibited committees meeting without approval while the Senate was in session. Senators had given committee attendance as an excuse for their absences.

[14] C.R., 79-1, p. 2053.

[15] Under unanimous consent procedure, the Senate later authorized these committees to ignore the time requirements.

[16] C.R., 79-1, pp. 7082–83.

[17] C.R., 79-1, p. 6568, June 4, 1945.

[18] C.R., 79-1, p. 7082, June 28, 1945.

[19] C.R., 79-1, p. 3289, Apr. 10, 1945.

Senator LaFollette called for the abolition of the practice of listing the names of senators on a quorum call as if they were present, although they did not answer on the particular call. He said:

"The practice as it works now is that the desk is furnished a list from the Republican side and from the Democratic side of Senators who are known to be out of the city. Then the roll is called. A few Senators appear. The names of a sufficient number are put on the roll to constitute a quorum, and then subsequently, no matter if it is 4 hours later, the name of any Senator who puts in a visible appearance in the Chamber is placed on that roll. Today, there were 32 Senators present in the Chamber when the announcement was made that 49 were present or had responded."[20]

Under the leadership of Senator Barkley, the Senate refused to begin the practice of "extending the remarks of Senators in the *Record*," without any part of them having been delivered.[21]

In discussing the appointment of conferees on the Federal Airport Bill (S. 2), Senator Bailey, chairman of the Commerce Committee—the committee which handled the bill—stated the practice of the Senate in naming its conferees. He said as chairman of the Committee:

"I filed with the President of the Senate just now a list of five names. Mine is not on the list, so I am not embarrassed. That is the custom which I have always followed in the Senate, and according to my recollection that is the universal custom. But let no Senator for one minute get the impression that I am insisting on any right to name conferees. They are named by the Chair, and I take it if the Chair does not satisfy the Senate, the Senate may name them."[22]

House Procedure. Approximately a thousand of the 1,184 measures passed by the House were disposed of under unanimous consent procedure. The others were called up under special rules, suspension of the rules, Calendar Wednesday, privileged business because of the nature of the bills (such as appropriation bills), and District of Columbia day. Sixty-four resolutions were adopted providing for the immediate consideration of legislative measures, the greatest number ever adopted during any one session of Congress.[23] Seventy-six resolutions providing for the immediate consideration of bills were reported to the House by the Rules Committee, but seven of them were laid on the table, three were still on the calendar at the close of the session, and two failed to pass when voted on.[24]

[20] C.R., 79-1, p. 3302, Apr., 1945. Senator Ellender stated: "I cannot help but observe that we have fallen into the silly practice of permittng Senators to poke their heads through the door and answer 'Present' and be recorded as being present, when other Senators who are busily engaged in important committee hearings are shown to be absent."

[21] C.R., 79-1, pp. 5994–5, June 11, 1945.

[22] C.R., 79-1, p. 1032, Oct. 22, 1945.

[23] See this REVIEW, Vol. 37, p. 295, footnote 14, and subsequent articles reviewing the sessions of Congress.

[24] H. Res. 407, H. Res. 248.

An analysis of the 64 rules adopted and the two rejected shows that 48 were open rules, merely providing for the immediate consideration of an equal number of bills, 11 waived points of order against the bills for whose immediate consideration they provided, five merely prohibited points of order against five appropriation bills,[25] and two provided for calling up two bills (legislative appropriation bill and the manpower control bill) from the Speaker's table and sending them to conference.[26] Two of the closed rules provided that the bills should be considered as having been read for amendments, and only authorized members of the committee in each instance could offer amendments.

Of the 74 bills and resolutions[27] for which rules were reported to the House, only 36 became public law; 22 passed the House, but died in the Senate; three failed of passage in the House and four others were left pending on the calendar without consideration; three were left in conference; one was reported out of conference but not cleared for the White House; two House concurrent resolutions were approved by both houses; one passed both houses but had not been sent to conference at the end of the session; and two bills were vetoed.

These results definitely disclose that the Rules Committee is not used solely as a party organization to clear the way for consideration of legislation sponsored by the majority party leadership; on the contrary, the leadership and Administration publicly disclosed their opposition to measures the committee cleared for House consideration. Thus, bills considered under this procedure were rejected by the House itself, by the Senate, and by the Administration.

The Rules Committee on different occasions made decisions, it seemed, to satisfy primarily a majority of its own membership. And it was commonly agreed that the majority membership of the committee did not represent the Administration, or the country geographically.[28]

Representative Sabath, chairman of the committee, in presenting several of the rules, told the House that even he was opposed to them. To

[25] The five bills are H.R. 2689, H.R. 3109, H.R. 3199, H.R. 3368, and H.R. 3579.

[26] Fifty-eight specified a maximum time for general debate (to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing it) of a particular bill (20 provided for one hour, 19 for two hours, 6 for three hours, 8 for four hours, 1 for eight hours, 1 for one day, and 3 for two days).

[27] Seventy-six rules providing for the consideration of legislation were reported to the House, but only 74 bills were involved since four of the 76 were devoted to the disposition of only two bills.

[28] The California Democratic delegation, on January 8, 1945, asked for Western representation on the Rules Committee; it pointed out that the committee membership at the time included only one member from west of the Mississippi and no one at all from the vast area west of the Missouri River. See Washington News Service —ticker—Jan. 8, 1945.

illustrate, in reporting the rule to provide for the consideration of the bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act, he stated: "Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is not of my making. I have reported it and am calling it up for consideration only because I have been so directed by the Committee on Rules."[29]

Representative Bulwinkle (Dem. of N.C.) accused the committee of over-stepping its authority in its disposition of the so-called George bill (S. 375). Its function, he said, was to expedite legislation approved by legislative committees, but in point of fact it had called witnesses and gone into the merits of a given bill, which it never has had a right to do.[30] In furtherance of this point of view, the committee, in considering a rule for consideration of the FEPC Bill (H. R. 2232), urged the Labor Committee to give further consideration to the merits of this measure, which it had already reported. Representative Randolph, chairman of the Labor subcommittee which handled the bill, agreed to call the subcommittee together to talk over the suggestions. Nothing further, however, was done either way.[31]

Calendar Wednesday procedure was used once during the session. Six committees were called, with only the Judiciary Committee answering; it called up two bills.[32] The suspension of rules procedure was used for the passage of six bills, on six different days;[33] and only three of them became law. The Discharge Rule was invoked only once, and then to discharge the Rules Committee from consideration of H. Res. 139, to bring the Poll Tax Bill (H. R. 7) to the floor for consideration. This bill passed the House, but was left pending in the Senate at the end of the session.

As in the Senate, the attendance was generally bad. As a result of Republican victories in the House in the adoption of various amendments to the OPA price extension, Representative Ramspeck, Democratic whip, stated that the absence from the floor of about 78 Democrats who were in the city had accounted for the GOP success. "It is about time they woke up," he said. "It is the responsibility of the Democratic party to legislate and, therefore, more important that Democrats be on the floor than Republicans."[34] A somewhat similar situation obtained when the House was considering the War Agencies Appropriation Bill. An amendment which had been adopted in committee of the whole by a vote of 87 to 69 was rejected in the House by a standing vote of 113 to 100.[35]

[29] C.R., 79-1, p. 12,004, Dec. 11, 1945.

[30] Washington News Service—ticker—Feb. 19, 1945.

[31] Washington News Service—ticker—Apr. 20, 1945.

[32] S. 340, insurance regulation; and H.R. 37, Amend Bankruptcy Act as applied to railroads.

[33] H. Con. Res. 39, H.R. 2647, S. 938, H.R. 3118, H.R. 1654, and H. J. Res. 98.

[34] Washington News Service—ticker—June 22, 1945.

[35] See *Governmental Affairs* for June 8 and June 11, 1945.

Speaker Rayburn took the floor on different occasions to support the Administration. He spoke in support of the manpower bill, which failed to become law, and for the reorganization of government agencies, which became law.[36]

Many representatives rose to points of personal privilege because of comments by other members, and the like; and on several occasions during heated debate a few representatives almost came to blows.

By a vote of 207 to 186, the Dies Committee (Committee on Un-American Activity) was made a standing committee. On the opening day of the session, when Representative Sabath moved that the House adopt the rules of the Seventy-eighth Congress as the rules of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Representative Rankin (Dem.) of Mississippi caught the opposition off guard and moved that the rules of the House relative to standing committees be amended to make the Dies Committee a standing committee.[37]

During House consideration of the First Deficiency Appropriation Bill (H. R. 4805), the Appropriations Committee lost control and amendments greatly increasing the amount of appropriations were added.[38]

Legislative Activity. A total of 658 laws were enacted, of which 293 were public and 365 private. The House passed 1,184 bills and resolutions, and the Senate 1,005.[39] Sixty-two measures were sent to conference, of which 49 were cleared for enactment and thirteen were left in conference at the

[36] See C.R. 79-1, p. 672, for Jan. 31, and p. 9599, for Oct. 4.

[37] C.R., 79-1, pp. 8–9, Jan. 3, 1945.

[38] In all, the House added $303,792,000 to the funds provided for in the bill over the sum recommended by the committee; as reported, the bill proposed funds totaling $1,131,452,312.

[39] Each house played a more important rôle in legislative activity than the above figures show. Of the 1,184 measures passed by the House, 679 were House bills, 195 Senate bills, 36 House joint resolutions, 13 Senate joint resolutions, 29 House concurrent resolutions, 11 Senate concurrent resolutions, and 221 simple House resolutions. In the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, only 953 measures were passed. During the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, 5,995 bills and resolutions were introduced in the House, of which 5,111 were House bills, 296 House joint resolutions, 119 House concurrent resolutions, and 469 House resolutions. (In the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, 2,171 bills and resolutions were introduced in the House.) House committees made 1,470 reports. Of the 1,005 measures passed by the Senate in the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, 323 were Senate bills, 472 House bills, 20 Senate joint resolutions, 30 House joint resolutions, 18 Senate concurrent resolutions, 27 House concurrent resolutions, and 115 Senate resolutions. In the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, only 931 measures were passed. During the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, 2,118 bills and resolutions were introduced in the Senate, of which 1,730 were Senate bills, 129 Senate joint resolutions, 49 Senate concurrent resolutions, and 210 Senate resolutions. (In the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, 825 bills and resolutions were introduced in the Senate.) Senate committees made 888 reports.

close of the session.[40] Many measures, after having advanced one or more steps toward enactment, were left unfinished.

Appropriations. Congress enacted 21 appropriation bills involving a total of $70,237,289,173 of direct appropriations compared with $67,614,456,131 during the previous session. The budget estimates submitted by the President totaled $71,487,838,186. The 21 bills involved contract authorizations totaling $1,514,169,413, and estimated reappropriations of unexpended funds totaled about $17,000,000,000. All of these huge sums were not spent, however. The President directed over $50,000,000,000 already appropriated held in reserve or reverted to the Treasury, and he ordered over $8,000,000,000 worth of contract authorizations suspended.[41]

In pursuance of budget estimates, the House Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 3146, Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, involving $18,433,000, and the House debated it for one day, but because of dissensions developing within the membership, the bill was put aside and no further action was taken on it. This occurrence is rare in House procedure. Again, in the case of the War Agencies Appropriation Bill (H.R. 3368), the two bodies passed the measure in different forms, the House refusing any funds for the FEPC. The House leadership at first would not accept the Senate amendment. Instead, the bill was referred back to the House Appropriations Committee; the committee in return reported out a new War Agencies Appropriation Bill (H.R. 3649), revised to eliminate funds for the FEPC. The House passed the bill on July 5 (five days after the end of the 1946 fiscal year) after most of the provisions had been stricken out on points of order, and further action on it was stayed. Suddenly the House leadership reached a compromise and agreed to accept the first War Agencies Appropriation Bill (H.R. 3368), including "compromised-funds" for the FEPC, clearing the bill for the President.

Investigating Committees. The House and Senate ordered many investigations—a greater number than during the first session of the record-breaking Seventy-eighth Congress.[42] The nature and the power and juris-

[40] At the close of the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, five were left in conference; 64 were sent to conference in that session.

[41] Congress passed H.R. 4407, rescinding certain wartime appropriations and contract authorizations totaling $51,244,680,213. This bill never became law, the President having vetoed it because of a rider providing for the return of the employment services to the states within 120 days.

[42] See this REVIEW, Vol. 38, p. 311; also Vol. 39, p. 332. The Seventy-eighth Congress spent a record-breaking $2,225,000 for an unprecedented number of special investigations; $2,234,500 was authorized. Only $700,000 of that amount was spent by the Senate, making the first time in history, according to Congressional disbursing officials, that the House spent more money for investigations than the Senate. (See Washington News Service—ticker—for Dec. 29, 1944.)

diction of the committees making them were defined by the authorizing resolution in each instance, as adopted respectively by the House and Senate. The investigations were actually conducted by special committees, standing committees, or subcommittees designated by standing committees. The House adopted 27 resolutions[43] authorizing an equal number of investigations, of which only four were undertaken by "special committees"[44]; the other 23 were made by one of the House standing committees or a subcommittee thereof. The Senate voted for 23 investigations,[45] of which nine[46] were by "special committees."

The twelve-man Joint Committee on Organization of Congress was continued; it was very active, holding hearings and compiling data, but its final report had not been filed at the close of the session.[47] The Joint Committee on Investigation of Pearl Harbor, while not created until September 11, became very active in the latter part of the session.[48]

[43] The subjects of investigation were: National Defense, by Military Affairs Committee (H.Res. 20); National Defense, by Merchant Marine and Fisheries (H.Res. 38); Physically Handicapped (H.Res. 45); Executive Agencies, by Appropriations (H.Res. 50); Immigration and Naturalization Problems (H.Res. 52); Marketing, Transportation, and Distribution of Farm Products (H.Res. 54); Post-War Military Policy (H.Res. 55); Post-War Economic Policy and Planning (H.Res. 60); Defense Housing Program (H.Res. 62); War Effects on Education in Colleges and Universities (H.Res. 63); Small Business (H.Res. 64); Civil Service System and Civilian Employment (H.Res. 66); Wild Life (H.Res. 75); Jurisdiction of Government Agencies (H.Res. 88); Grade Labeling (H.Res. 93); Public Lands (H.Res. 96); Insular Affairs (H.Res. 99); Conduct of two federal judges (H.Res. 138); National Defense, by Naval Affairs Committee (H.Res. 154); Petroleum (H.Res. 187); Veterans Administration (H.Res. 192); Food Shortages (H.Res. 195); Social Security (H.Res. 204); Highways, Roads, Streets, and Bridges (H.Res. 255); Shore and Beach Erosion (H.Res. 256); Foreign Affairs (H.Res. 315); and Study of Commerce outside the U.S. (H.Res. 323). [44] See H.Res. 64, 75, 88, and 195.

[45] The subjects of investigation were: Authority for Issuance of Executive Orders and Departmental Regulations (S.Res. 16); Public Lands (S.Res. 18); Silver Purchase Act (S.Res. 20); International Communications by Wire and Radio (S.Res. 24); Small Business (S.Res. 28); Supply and Distribution of Hydroelectric Power (S.Res. 31); Postwar Economic Policy and Planning (S.Res. 33); Certain Activities of SEC and Post Office Department in Florida (S.Res. 35); Petroleum Resources (S.Res. 36); Wild Animal Life (S.Res. 43); Problems of War Mobilization (S.Res. 46); Naval Establishment in Western Hemisphere (S.Res. 48); Investigation of War Program—commonly known as Truman Committee (S.Res. 55); Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool (S.Res. 58); Production, Transportation, and Use of Fuels West of Mississippi (S.Res. 60); Airplane Crashes (S.Res. 61); Health Personnel, Facilities, and Related Services (S.Res. 62); Japanese Treatment of Philippine Population (S.Res. 79); Sale of Nashville, Tenn., Newspaper (S.Res. 87); Food and Allied Products (S.Res. 92); Economic Conditions of Philippine Islands (S.Res. 123); War Contracts (S.Res. 129); and Atomic Energy (S.Res. 179).

[46] See Senate Resolutions 20, 28, 33, 36, 43, 55, 58, 60, 179.

[47] George B. Galloway, chairman of the Committee on Congress of the APSA, was named staff director for this Committee. [48] S. Con. Res. 27.

The Senate as a Council. Nominations received by the Senate during the session totaled 11,056, of which 10,966 were confirmed, two rejected, 11 withdrawn, and 77 left unconfirmed.[49] This compares with 10,119 submitted in the previous session.

While nearly all of the nominations were disposed of without opposition, a few were strenuously contested. Standing committees even adversely reported to the Senate three of the major nominations;[50] but only one of these, the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, to be REA administrator, was finally rejected.[51] The test vote on this issue came when the Senate, by a vote of 52 to 33, temporarily put aside the proposed Mexican Water Treaty to begin consideration of the nomination, which was rejected by a coalition vote of 36 yeas to 52 nays. The nomination of Raymond S. McKeough to be a member of the Maritime Commission was fought on the ground that he was closely affiliated with the CIO-PAC, but after a heated debate he was confirmed on October 11, by a vote of 42 to 34.

The nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce would have been defeated, no doubt, had Congress not first enacted S. 375, to divorce certain lending agencies (including RFC) from the Department of Commerce, making them independent. Opponents of Mr. Wallace tried to get a vote on the nomination before the bill was granted consideration, but the motion was lost by a coalition vote of 41 yeas to 43 nays.[52] The disposition of this bill and nomination took much time and discussion; and the entire Senate membership disclosed a strong interest in it.

Other nominations given particular consideration in the Senate included that of Claude R. Wickard to be REA Administrator, Dean G. Acheson to be Undersecretary of State, and Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General.

Contrary to its practice of the last several sessions, the Senate spent a significant amount of time on the consideration of treaties.[53] In the face

[49] The two nominations rejected included that of Aubrey W. Williams, to be REA administrator. See *Civilian Nominations*, compiled by L. W. Bailey, executive clerk, for Secretary of the Senate, pp. 1–463.

[50] Henry A. Wallace, to be Secretary of Commerce, was adversely reported by the Commerce Committee by a vote of 6 to 11; Aubrey W. Williams, to be REA administrator, was adversely reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by a vote of 8 to 12; and Raymond S. McKeough, to be a member of the Maritime Commission, was adversely reported by the Commerce Committee by a vote of 7 to 10 (See *Governmental Affairs* for Jan. 31, Mar. 2, and Oct. 1, 1945).

[51] The nomination was debated on five different days, involving over 103 pages of the *Record*.

[52] C.R., 79-1, p. 707, Feb. 1, 1945.

[53] Two (oil agreement and water treaty with Mexico) were sent to the Senate in the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Ten treaties (Executive A–J, inclusive) were sent to the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, First Session, and made public. President Roosevelt submitted the Civil Aviation Treaty to the Senate

of little or no opposition, it debated the United Nations Charter for 220 pages of the *Record* and finally approved the treaty by a vote of 89 to 2.[54] The Mexican Water Treaty, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Texas, to the Gulf of Mexico, was debated off and on for ten days, involving 187 pages of the *Record*, and was finally assented to by a vote of 76 to 10. A reservation by Senator Hawkes, to prohibit the treaty from interfering with existing state compacts, was rejected by a vote of 23 to 63.

On May 9, the House passed and sent to the Senate H.J. Res. 60, to amend the Constitution so as to provide for the ratification of treaties by a majority vote of the two houses instead of a two-thirds vote by the Senate. At the close of the First Session, no further action had been taken on the proposal.[55]

The Administration and Congress: During the session, Congress had the rare experience of dealing with two different presidents of the same party. The relations between Roosevelt and Congress remained much the same as in the previous session; the case of Mr. Truman was different. The first months of the Truman administration found Congress and the President in complete accord; for the remainder of the year, the decisions by Congress pointed to question and doubt as to continued good relationships between the two arms of the government.

The Administration's legislative program was submitted to Congress first by President Roosevelt in his State of the Union and Budget messages, and later by President Truman in his special message of September 6, 1945, together with a series of others.

The strained relations and breaks at no time were quite as pronounced as in the previous session, when Senator Barkley, floor leader of the Senate, repudiated President Roosevelt on the Senate floor because of disagreement over the tax bill. Individual senators were frequently outspoken in criticism of Administrative action, but that is not quite like the top agent of the party announcing his "parting of ways."

Perhaps the most pronounced conflict between Congress and President

---

on Mar. 12, 1945, following a heated meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in which members demanded that air agreements be submitted as a treaty. The message accompanying the agreement read: "with a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification." This unusual wording seemed to question whether the convention actually required ratification. (See Washington News Service—ticker—for Mar. 12, 1945.)

[54] Only Senators Langer and Shipstead voted in the negative (See *Governmental Affairs*, for July 30, 1945).

[55] The House Report warned that the two-thirds rule "has forced Chief Executives" to resort to executive agreements in foreign pacts. "This is an unhealthy tendency," the report continued.

Roosevelt came over the so-called "Work or Fight" bill (H.R. 1752), which passed both houses in different forms after much Administrative pressure in support thereof,[56] but which was finally killed after a conference report had been filed on the two passed versions.[57] In keeping with the same general program, President Roosevelt asked that Congress "provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces."[58] A bill in pursuance of the request was passed by the House and reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs, but then it died on the Senate calendar, without consideration.[59] Mr. Roosevelt also urged Congress on two different occasions to enact peacetime universal military training.[60]

In his messages to Congress in the early part of the session, President Roosevelt outlined a far-reaching program, but at the time of his death Congress had not enacted the recommendations; defeat of the first two mentioned issues had already become certain. Bills for universal military training are still pending in both houses without action.

Most of the unfinished business urged upon Congress by President Roosevelt was inherited by Truman, who not only accepted it *en bloc* but sent new messages to Congress making his support of it, as well as of additional legislation, a matter of public record.[61]

Before the close of the session, in spite of the rough sailing between Truman and Congress in the later months of the year, much of the Administration's program was written into law, such as extension of the Trade Agreements Act (with an additional 50 per cent increase or decrease authorized), Bretton Woods Agreements, United Nations Charter, salary adjustment for federal employees, surplus property bill to set up a single administrator, reduction in taxes,[62] reorganization of government agencies, financial control over government corporations, the extension

[56] President Roosevelt recommended the legislation in his State of the Union message and various other subsequent communications, including personal letters to chairmen of the committees handling the bill.

[57] The House adopted the conference report by a vote of 167 to 160, but the Senate rejected it by a vote of 29 to 46, after several days of debate. The vote in the Senate showed 18 Democrats and 11 Republicans voting for the report and 21 Democrats, 24 Republicans, and 1 Progressive voting against it. Under unanimous consent, the House then returned the whole issue to the House Military Affairs Committee, and no further action was taken on it (see *Record* for Apr. 23, 1945).

[58] In his State of the Union message, he told Congress that "the need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting."

[59] See action on H.R. 2277.

[60] See State of Union message.

[61] For details of recommendations by President Truman, see his messages to Congress dated Apr. 16, June 1, Sept. 6, Nov. 19, May 24, Dec. 3, and Oct. 3.

[62] The bill as enacted was not in keeping with all of the recommendations of the Treasury Department.

of the Price Control Act, and more liberal credit and benefits to veterans. On the other hand, Congress either rejected or failed to approve several major proposals, in spite of persistent urging on the part of the President, who on one occasion made an appeal by radio directly to the people, over the heads of the representatives and senators. Still pending for further Congressional action were: unemployment compensation,[63] full employment,[64] FEPC,[65] USES extension,[66] fact-finding boards,[67] health and medical care,[68] minimum wage increase,[69] housing,[70] presidential succession,[71] liberalization of social security,[72] St. Lawrence Waterway,[73] Missouri Valley Authority,[74] universal military training,[75] and unification of armed forces.[76]

The Administration was not unmindful of Congressional criticism when senators and representatives accused it of flaunting the will of Congress in administering the laws. The OPA was influenced on various occasions no doubt, under the suspense of what Congress might do to it if it ignored the wishes publicly expressed in the halls of Congress; the same was true in connection with the transportation of servicemen, the demobilization program of the Army, and other activities.

"Lobbying" on the part of the Administration to get bills enacted, defeated, or modified was not uncommon, to say the least. The situation became at one time so distasteful to the House leadership that Speaker Rayburn, in his press conference when the bill to reorganize government agencies (H.R. 4129) was under consideration, warned administrative officials to stay away from Capitol Hill, and to stop lobbying to get their respective agencies exempted from the reorganization bill. He told the reporters that he knew who the offenders were, and that if they did not desist he would call names.

During the session, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman vetoed 27 bills;[77] no bill became law over a veto. The House made an attempt to override Mr. Truman's veto of the bill to defer registrants engaged in agriculture from induction under the Selective Service Act, but it failed by a vote of 185 to 177.[78] One private bill (H.R. 1975) was allowed to become law without presidential approval. Four of the vetoes were of the pocket variety.

[63] S. 1274. [64] S. 380. [65] S. 101 and H.R. 2232.
[66] H.R. 4437. [67] S. 1661 and H.R. 4908.
[68] S. 1606 and H.R. 4730. [69] S. 1349, etc. [70] S. 1592.
[71] H.R. 3587. [72] S. 1050 and H.R. 3293. [73] S. J. Res. 104.
[74] S. 555. [75] H.R. 515, S. 188, and S. 1473. [76] S. 84.
[77] Most of the bills vetoed were private.
[78] C.R., 79-1, pp. 4223–4233.

POLITICAL PARTIES IN NEW YORK CITY

HUGH A. BONE
Queens College

Though declining to run for a fourth term in 1945, Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia boasted: "Listen, I could run on a laundry ticket and be elected!" At one time or another during his political career, the Mayor had run under nine different party labels—under as many as four in a single election. To the outsider and the New Yorker alike, this multiplicity of candidacies and parties in New York City is highly confusing. The multi-party system is due to many factors, especially the election laws, the size and complexion of the population, the existence of an active independent movement, and the recent political activity of and schisms within organized labor.

I

Of foremost importance in contributing to the bewildering political set-up is the state election law, which places local control of the party in the county committee.[1] New York City is composed of five counties or boroughs,[2] without any formal city-wide party organization. Consequently, there are five autonomous and unrelated centers of control within a municipal party. Intra-party and inter-borough rivalry under these circumstances is not surprising.[3]

The election law requires that the county committee be composed of at least two representatives elected in the primaries from each election district in the county. In Manhattan alone there are 976 election districts, which means that this county's committee must have a minimum of 1,952 members.[4] The result of this situation is the ability to control from the top, with the parties potentially unresponsive to the will of the enrolled voters. There is often a complete absence of primary fights for city-wide offices;

[1] McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York, *Election Law*, Art. 2, sec. 12.

[2] The population of these boroughs in 1940 was: Bronx, 1,394,711; Brooklyn (Kings County), 2,698,285; Manhattan (New York County), 1,889,924; Queens, 1,297,634; and Richmond, 174,441.

[3] Brooklyn, Bronx, and Queens leaders are jealous of interference by Tammany Hall (the New York County Democratic organization), following an old cry: "The Tiger must not cross the bridge." However, there are frequent attempts, both ways, to "cross the bridge."

[4] The New York County Democratic Committee rules permit additional members over and above this minimum, so that there are many more than two thousand members on the committee. The rule provides that each election district shall be entitled to an additional member for every 20 votes cast in the district for the Democratic candidate for governor at the last general election; while the Republican rules allow one additional member for each 50 party votes in excess of 100. In Brooklyn, the Bronx, and Queens, the statutory minimum on the county committees is, respectively, 2,592, 1,700, and 1,602.

the nominees are generally named at a caucus of the leaders of the five organizations and "ratified" in the primaries. At the last Democratic County Committee meeting in New York, the two thousand members ratified unanimously, by a voice vote, all resolutions and personnel recommendations presented by Leader Edward V. Loughlin.[5] The Tammany chairman also appoints all standing and special committees as well as the assistant treasurer.

To complicate the situation, the rules for county organization differ from borough to borough, and few in the party have any clear conception of their own committee's rules, let alone those of the other counties. For example, the New York County Republican rules provide for the choice of election district representatives on the primary ballot. In these primary contests for county committeemen, struggle between factions often occurs. After the primary, the successful leaders in the 16 assembly districts cast the vote for county chairman, "said vote to be numerically equivalent to the number of county committeemen elected in said assembly district."[6] In the Democratic organization, the county chairman and leader are two different persons. The latter is the real leader and, by custom, is chosen by the 16 district leaders to represent them on the executive committee. A Tammany leader's power and tenure, therefore, rest upon the support of assembly district leaders.[7] In Brooklyn, however, the regulations permit the Democratic County Committee to elect its chairman "in a manner directed by the committee." A city-wide committee of manageable proportions and uniform county committee practices in the choice of leaders and executive committees would help to simplify the organizational aspects of party government in New York City.

A characteristic feature of the party organizations is the political clubs,

[5] *New York Times*, Aug. 9, 1945.

[6] The vote may be challenged by one-fifth of all the members of the assembly district delegation; and thereupon the secretary calls for the vote of each committeeman. Thomas J. Curran's leadership has gone unchallenged for a number of years in New York county. The other Republican leaders are: John R. Crews, Brooklyn; Warren B. Ashmead, Queens; John J. Knewitz, Bronx; and Edward Ruppell, Richmond.

[7] The insurgents in the 1945 primary contest had the "across the river" indirect support of Edward J. Flynn, Bronx leader, but were badly defeated. As a result, Tammany is now under the complete control of Leader Loughlin, Secretary Bert Stand, and the chairman of the Elections Committee, Clarence H. Neal, Jr. Frank V. Kelly and Jeremiah Sullivan are the Brooklyn and Richmond leaders, respectively. The landslide victory of Mayor William O'Dwyer in 1945 strengthened the position of the Queens Democratic leader, Congressman James A. Roe. See *Long Island Star-Journal*, Nov. 7, 1945. On Tammany Hall bosses and machines, see M. R. Werner, *Tammany Hall* (Garden City, New York, 1928); W. B. and J. B. Northrup, *The Insolence of Office* (New York, 1932); and John Dewey, *New York and the Seabury Investigation* (New York, 1933).

which Professor Peel calls the "ganglia of politics."[8] Time permitting, resourceful assembly district leaders weld these clubs into powerful vote-getting and service institutions.

The election laws allowing multiple nominations also add to the confusion of the political picture.[9] Throughout the entire state, it has become fairly common for persons to seek nomination and run for office under more than one party label. In the 1942 congressional elections, nominees in 31 out of the state's 43 congressional districts ran under two or more party labels. This was increased in 1944, when double or triple designations of a single candidate occurred in 41 out of 45 districts.[10] In recent elections, the most common endorsements were Democratic-American Labor and Republican-Liberal, though occasionally there were Republican-American Labor combinations.

At times, a nominee has captured the primaries of all major parties. The outstanding illustration is that of Representative Vito Marcantonio, who, beginning in 1940, captured the nomination of the Republican, Democratic, and American Labor parties.[11] Though professing not to be a member of the Communist party, his voting record in Congress shows faithful adherence to the "party line." Marcantonio first ran for Congress in 1932 as a Republican and as a foe of Tammany. His consorting with the New Deal and Communists led Republicans to read him out of the party in 1936. The same year, he joined the American Labor party and was likewise shortly disowned by several state leaders. At this point he began to organize his own machine, keeping the support of many Republican captains. He beat the machine candidate in the Republican primary in 1938, and at the same time captured 30 per cent of the votes in the Democratic primary. Since then he has received little opposition from Tammany, and has had the support of its secretary, Clarence H. Neal, Jr.[12] Though admittedly exceptional, this practice is perplexing to voters who believe that party labels stand for differences in principle.

[8] Roy V. Peel, *The Political Clubs of New York City* (New York, 1935). An intimate glimpse of the social and political aspects of these clubs is also to be obtained from Alfred E. Smith, *Up To Now; An Autobiography* (New York, 1929).

[9] Besides New York, only California, Maine, and Vermont permit unqualified "double filing." Maryland and Massachusetts permit double filing for some offices. In the former state, candidates may seek several nominations, but are prohibited from running in the general election on more than one ticket. On the subject, see Robert W. Binkley, Jr., *Double Filing in Primary Elections* (Bureau of Public Administration, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, 1945).

[10] In 1942, there were 43 congressional districts, with two representatives elected at large. In 1944, the state was reapportioned into 45 districts.

[11] Representative Adam C. Powell, of Harlem, duplicated this feat in his district in 1944.

[12] "One of Neal's protegés, James Pemberton, a young Negro, has become the major-domo of Marcantonio's machine. Pemberton, a Tammany district leader, is personally devoted to Marcantonio, and, since his clubhouse chores are few these

II

In New York City's population of seven and one-half million are found large racial, nationalistic, religious, and other minority groups, each potentially, if not actually, contributing to factionalism. Party leaders strive to attract these groups by putting forth "balanced" tickets in terms of religion and nationality. Many, if not most, office-seekers feel compelled to use all known techniques to solicit the aid of minorities, or to play off one minority against another. In the recent election, one campaigner referred to the head of his ticket as a "Jewish pocket edition of Al Smith." In a primary contest for county judge, one candidate demanded that his nationality be given equality of representation in nomination. In a letter to registered voters, he said: "According to voting representation, the Italo-Americans should have received nominations for four assembly seats, two state senators, and one congressman, but we got nothing! . . . This year the nomination for county judge was promised to an 'Italian-American,' but when the time came, the 'Party' gave it to an Irish-American."

In forging a party machine of his own, Vito Marcantonio evolved a formula for capturing the minorities of his district. For a beginning, his name and the blessing of Mayor La Guardia impressed the Italians. "He ingratiated himself with the Puerto Ricans, who harbor no love for the Romans, by championing their nationalism, by flying to their island to defend some rebels beleaguered by the law, and by writing a bill to grant Puerto Rico immediate independence with staggering indemnities. . . . Negroes and Jews in his district were won by his spirited denunciation of Jim Crow and anti-semitism. On his staff of five or six secretaries, each race is represented."[13]

Proportional representation, instituted in New York City in 1936 for the election of members of the city council, reflects the various political and ethnic groups. The present council is nominally composed of fourteen Democrats, three Republicans, and two each from the ranks of the Communists, Laborites, and Liberals. The council includes members of the three religious faiths, a Negro, and representatives of several different nationalities.

The strong civic consciousness and the voting independence prevailing in the city are often turned into political organization. Citizens' groups are ever ready to back independent nominees, bolters, and third-party candidates in the interest of good government or for less laudable reasons. The Fusionist movement has put the Tammany machine to rout on more

---

days, he spends nearly all of his time working for the Congressman. . . . Through Pemberton, Marcantonio can always get his point of view across in Tammany executive meetings. Richard H. Rovere, "Vito Marcantonio: Machine Politician, New Style," *Harper's Mag.*, Vol. 188, p. 397 (Apr., 1944). This article gives a very useful insight into practical politics in New York City.

[13] *Rovere*, p. 394.

than one occasion, most recently in 1933. Mr. La Guardia was first elected on a Fusionist ticket in that year, and became the only reform mayor in the city's history to be elected for three successive terms. This is a tribute not only to his showmanship and political astuteness, but also to the electorate's recognition of the value of combination for political action.[14]

Out of this independence has grown two more or less permanent fusion groups. The City Fusion party was formed in 1933 and runs candidates under its own label.[15] The Citizens Non-Partisan Committee was created in 1936 to try to elect candidates friendly to proportional representation and to county reorganization. At times, the two groups have failed to agree on nominees and have placed their own choices on the ballot.[16]

The 1945 mayoralty contest affords an illustration of the blocs and combinations which fuse together at election time. The Democrats nominated District Attorney William O'Dwyer for mayor, and were soon joined by the American Labor and American Veterans parties,[17] the CIO and National Citizens' Political Action Committee, and the Communist Political Association. The Republican, Liberal, and City Fusion party leaders, "in the interest of good government," chose a Democrat, General Sessions Judge Jonah J. Goldstein. The Citizens Union and Citizens Non-Partisan Committee then announced their support of Judge Goldstein.

At this juncture, Mayor La Guardia declared that both Goldstein and O'Dwyer were Tammany Democrats and had been named by the "bosses." Both of the major parties, he charged, were "planning and scheming to form combinations against good government."[18] Out of this dissent was created the "No Deal" party, which proceeded as an independent party to file a slate headed by Newbold Morris, a Republican and president of the City Council.[19] The Socialist, Industrial Government, and Trotskyist

[14] On Mayor La Guardia and New York City politics, see L. Limpus and B. Leyson, *This Man La Guardia* (New York, 1938); John Rogers, "The Terrific Mr. La Guardia," *American Mercury*, Vol. 58, pp. 149–156 (Feb., 1944); J. T. Salter (ed.), *The American Politician* (Chapel Hill, 1938), Chap. 1.

[15] A decade ago the City Fusion party was able to poll several hundred thousand votes.

[16] To become a recognized political party in New York State, a group must poll 50,000 votes for its candidate for governor. Only the Republican, Democratic, and American Labor parties are now qualified. Minor and municipal parties in New York City get on the ballot by means of nominating petitions; 7,500 signatures are required.

[17] The Board of Elections voided the nominating petition of the American Veterans party on the conceded fact that the election district addresses given for signers were wrong, being based upon the district numbers in force in 1944 instead of the 1945 numbers. *New York Times*, Aug. 29, 1945.

[18] *New York Times*, Aug. 8, 1945. For details on the charge that Goldstein's nomination was the result of a "deal," see text by Newbold Morris, *New York Times*, Oct. 13, 1945.

[19] Mr. Morris polled over 400,000 votes, the second largest vote on any party line. This is illustrative of the independent voter strength and of a "personal" party. (See Table I.)

TABLE I

NEW YORK CITY MAYORALTY ELECTIONS*

1941

Democrat (O'Dwyer)	*Republican* (La Guardia)	*Amer. Labor* (La Guardia)	*City Fusion* (La Guardia)	*United City* (La Guardia)	*Socialist* (Hartman)
1,054,175	668,455	435,256	63,308	19,282	22,647

1945

Democrat (O'Dwyer)	*Republican* (Goldstein)	*Amer. Labor* (O'Dwyer)	*City Fusion* (Goldstein)	*Liberal* (Goldstein)	*Socialist* (Glass)	*No Deal* (Morris)
867,389	300,519	257,930	8,141	122,316	9,304	408,348

* Because their vote was less than 2,000 each, the figures for the Industrial Government and Trotsky parties are omitted.

workers found none of these candidates to their liking and proceeded to enter their own. Nine party labels, therefore, appeared on the ballot!

III

One of the most interesting and complicating aspects of New York's political picture is labor's entry into politics through the avenue of party organization. The American Labor party was created in 1936 out of trade unions, a group of Old Guard Socialists, and Labor's Nonpartisan League, a Democratic auxiliary.[20] Many supporters of President Roosevelt and Senator Wagner were dissatisfied with the flavor of Tammany Hall and the new party was used to attract voters who disliked to vote for the New Deal candidates under the Democratic label. In presidential years, Tammany failed to work for President Roosevelt, and it was felt that an organization was needed for the job. Mayor La Guardia also staunchly supported the idea. Besides proving its independence of the Democratic party by endorsing La Guardia, the party elected five members each to the New York City Council and the State Assembly in 1937 and 1938. At its inception, the ALP was composed of 250 trade unions; the largest, and greatest, financial contributor was the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. All of the first state officers were union officials.[21]

During American Labor's decade as a state-wide party, it has at times endorsed Democrats and Republicans; on other occasions it has placed its own nominees in the race against the major parties. It joined the Republicans and the Fusionists in 1937 and in 1941 to reëlect La Guardia and polled two-thirds as many votes for him as did the Republicans. It gave Governor Lehman the margin of victory over Thomas E. Dewey in 1938 and duplicated the feat for President Roosevelt in 1940 and 1944. (See Table II.) It has been able to poll, with the exception of 1942, over

[20] For interesting details on the origin of the ALP, see Louis Waldman, *Labor Lawyer* (New York, 1944), and a pamphlet by James Oneal, *The American Labor Party; An Interpretation* (New York, 1937).

[21] These were: chairman, Luigi Antonini, vice-president of the I.L.G.W.U.; secretary, Alex Rose, vice-president of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers; treasurer, Andrew Armstrong, vice-president of the Printing Pressmen's Union of the A. F. of L.

TABLE II

NEW YORK STATE ELECTION STATISTICS

I. Presidential

1940

	Republican (Willkie)	*Democratic* (Roosevelt)	*American Labor* (Roosevelt)	*Socialist* (Thomas)	*Prohibition* (Babson)
Upstate	1,779,854	1,185,426	100,409	6,556	1,933
N.Y. City	1,247,624	1,649,074	317,009	12,394	1,317
Total	3,027,478	2,834,500	417,418	18,950	3,250

1944

	Republican (Dewey)	*Democratic* (Roosevelt)	*American Labor* (Roosevelt)	*Liberal* (Roosevelt)	*Socialist* (Thomas)	*Ind. Gov't.** (Teichert)
Upstate	1,716,360	1,130,844	107,814	23,080	4,860	3,382
N.Y. City	1,271,287	1,347,754	388,591	306,155	5,693	10,970
Total	2,987,647	2,478,598	496,405	329,235	10,553	14,532

II. Gubernatorial

1938

	Republican (Dewey)	*Democratic* (Lehman)	*Amer. Labor* (Lehman)	*Ind. Prog.* (Dewey)	*Socialist*** (Thomas)	*Ind. Gov't.*** (Orange)
Upstate	1,525,359	844,046	79,230	14,892		
N.Y. City	777,146	1,127,261	340,749	9,495		
Total	2,302,505	1,971,307	419,979	24,387	24,890	3,516

1942

	Republican (Dewey)	*Democratic* (Bennett)	*Amer. Labor* (Alfange)	*Socialist*** (Cheney)	*Communist*** (Amter)	*Ind. Gov't.** (Orange)
Upstate	1,410,893	678,078	57,069			
N.Y. City	737,653	822,961	346,577			
Total	2,148,546	1,501,039	403,626	21,911	45,220	3,496

* In New York, the Socialist Labor party uses the label Industrial Government.

** Breakdown of statistics between New York City and upstate unavailable.

400,000 votes in state-wide elections; and though three-fourths of its voting strength has been limited to New York City, the party has enjoyed a pivotal position in state politics.

Primary fights and quarrels over policy have beset the American Labor party from the beginning, many of these being due to the party's attitude toward communism. The Communists lost their position as a legal party in 1938 because of insufficient enrollment. They then began to infiltrate the ALP through the trade unions or as individuals. As isolationists, they tried to bring the ALP to their point of view and, in 1939, bitterly fought against a party resolution condemning the Nazi-Russian alliance. The right wing kept control of the state committee, but the left wing had come to dominate the New York County Committee. In 1940, the Communist faction rioted at the ALP convention in an effort to prevent the endorsement of President Roosevelt. Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers, exerted enough pressure to keep the ALP in line behind the President.

In the 1941 mayoralty campaign, the left-wing was grooming Marcantonio to run against the "pro-war" La Guardia, who had ALP endorsement. The sudden outbreak of war between Germany and Russia caused the "party line" to switch, and the left-wing went all out for La Guardia, Roosevelt, lend-lease, and the defense program. In 1942, the ALP deserted the Democratic candidate for governor and ran its own nominee. A minor split occurred when Hillman supported the Democratic gubernatorial nominee, and the Communists put up their own ticket. The Democratic-ALP split resulted in the election of Thomas E. Dewey.

In 1943, Hillman returned to the ALP, bringing with him the CIO Political Action Committee. The following year, on the suggestion of Earl Browder, the Communists dropped their party title to become the Communist Political Association. In an about-face of tactics, they came out for free enterprise and postwar reconstruction through the framework of the two-party system.[22] Hillman made an alliance with the Communists, who were eager to control the ALP, to launch an attack on the state leadership of the party.[23] Concisely, Hillman, supported by the CIO Industrial Union Council, "proposed to 'root' the party in the trade unions by welcoming the Communist unions *en bloc* and inviting their leaders into its councils."[24] He also proposed that voting strength of the various unions be determined by the size of their contributions.

The right-wing, under Dubinsky, feared that this plan would close the door to sympathetic middle-class progressives, and insisted that only non-Communist groups and unions be admitted to the inner organization. President Roosevelt and Mayor La Guardia tried to get Hillman to sever his ties with the left-wing and to withdraw his opposition,[24] but their pleas were unavailing and the left-wing won decisively at the ensuing primary.[25]

After a futile effort to heal the schism, the right-wing, at an organizing convention in May, launched a new party under the name Liberal, and proceeded to nominate Roosevelt and Wallace.[26] Out of about 1,000 delegates, 300 came from affiliates of the A. F. of L. and CIO, the remainder from local political organizations and civic and fraternal societies. Dr. John L.

[22] See *New York Herald-Tribune*, Jan. 10, 1944, and *New York Times*, Apr. 21, 1944. For an account of the switch in tactics and the Communist effort to permeate trade unions and the PAC, see Barrington Moore, Jr., "The Communist Party of the U. S. A.; An Analysis of a Social Movement," in this REVIEW, Vol. 39, pp. 31–41 (Feb., 1945).

[23] At this time, Professor George Counts was state chairman and Alex Rose, secretary.

[24] *New York Times*, Mar. 2, 1944.

[25] Six hundred and twenty-five out of 750 seats in the state convention were won by the left-wing. Even before the 1944 primary, the party committees in four out of five counties in New York City were under left-wing control.

[26] *New York Times*, May 20 and 21, 1945. See also *Platform and Declaration of the Liberal Party*.

Childs, of Columbia University, was chosen as state chairman, and several former members of the ALP became officers. To stave off Communist infiltration, a special by-law (Sec.4) refused membership to any person "who advocates, supports, follows, adheres to, or espouses any totalitarian doctrines, philosophy, or activity, whether it be Fascist, Nazi, Communist, or known by any other name." Though supporting the same national candidates in 1944, the Liberal party refused endorsement of local ALP nominees. The party polled 330,000 votes to 496,000 for the ALP (see Table II). Both parties received a substantially lower, but creditable, vote in the 1945 mayoralty campaign, and each elected two city councilmen.

As it stands today, the difference between the Labor and Liberal parties is one of personalities, composition, and principles. The leading labor personalities, respectively, are Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky.[27] Both have opposed the Communists, but the mind-set of the two toward them is different. Dubinsky refuses to join in a united front with the Communists in an election, partly because such action might encourage them in his own union. Hillman has been able to tolerate the Communists and shows a willingness to combine with them in elections. As chairman of the CIO-PAC, Hillman is in the position of supporting its policy of working with the Communists. Therefore, he has to take national affairs into consideration, while Dubinsky is mostly concerned with the New York state picture. In addition, there are numerous intangible factors difficult to define but no less real. One of these is the emotion among followers of each who have come to expect quarrels and differences between the two leaders.

The Liberal party has appealed to many intellectuals, progressives, and white collar workers and professionals who dislike Republican and Democratic machine politics.[28] Liberal business men of the two major parties have been generous contributors to the Liberal party—so much so that one of its least troublesome problems has been that of finance.

These differences of approach and backing offer an interesting contrast in respect to electioneering. The Liberal party has expended much money on campaign literature, posters, radio shows, and other publicity, but has

[27] Hillman is state chairman of the ALP and Dubinsky is first vice-chairman of the Executive Committee of the Liberal party, and both are heads of rival unions affiliated with the CIO and A. F. of L., respectively. Their relationship to the labor movement is useful in understanding the Labor-Liberal party cleavages. On this, see Waldman, *Labor Lawyer*, and Stolberg, *Tailor's Progress* and *The Story of the CIO* (New York, 1938).

[28] Many prominent anti-Dewey Republican liberals and business men welcomed the opportunity in 1944 to vote for Roosevelt under the Liberal party label.

built a less effective grass-roots party organization.[29] It has expended more money on functional organization, such as business and women's divisions, and less on club and district organizations. The Labor party, working with and learning from the PAC, has concentrated on old fashioned district organization, political clubs, and doorbell ringing. Its materials on platforms and programs are much less elaborate.

The approach of the two new parties toward politics may be illustrated by the 1945 mayoralty election. Both decided to join common cause with a major party. Tammany leaders, hoping to attain power again in the city, early made a coalition with the American Labor party. In return for the latter's support of its candidate for mayor, the Democratic machine endorsed several ALP nominees for city councilman, including the secretary of the Manhattan American Labor party, Eugene P. Connally. Similar alliances were worked out in a few upstate cities. In a few instances, Republican-ALP alliances were made.[30] The American Labor party broke away from the Fusionists in the 1945 mayoralty race because Governor Dewey supported the Republican nominee, and this break was believed to be a step toward defeating the Governor, who comes up for reëlection in 1946.[31]

The Liberal party, however, was less concerned with this view and wished to defeat what it considered "the unholy, opportunistic alliance between Tammany and the Communists," regardless of Mr. Dewey. Liberal party spokesmen declared: "We have never had good government in New York City without the support of the Republican party. It is tortured logic which holds we must suffer corrupt Tammany government in New York City in order to have progressive government in our state and nation."[32]

The 1945 Democratic-ALP alliance brought a landslide victory in New York City (see Table I), but fared less well upstate, where the Democratic-ALP mayoralty candidates were beaten in Buffalo, Syracuse, and Binghamton. Curious as the alliance is, it will probably remain through the 1946 elections, if not beyond.

[29] The Liberal party published a remarkable 69-page municipal program for New York City in 1945 entitled *For Our City*. (Obtainable from the party's state headquarters, 160 W. 44th Street, New York City.)

[30] In spite of a stand taken by Republican county leaders against the practice, the Republican candidate for borough president of Richmond, Cornelius P. Hall, accepted the endorsement of the ALP. *New York Times*, July 4, 1945.

[31] On the hostility of the ALP to Mr. Dewey, see *New York Times*, Sept. 4, 1945.

[32] *Liberal Party News*, Oct. 15, 1945. Leaders in the Liberal party also have not shared the intense dislike for Governor Dewey. Mr. Dubinsky has been grateful to the Governor because the latter has not restored home work, which at one time had been most troublesome to the I.L.G.W.U.

A question facing the observer of New York politics is whether the Labor and Liberal parties will merge into a single political action group. One favoring factor is the negligible difference between the two over national policies. On foreign policy, the Liberal party has been more critical of the "Big Three" agreements, concessions to the Soviet Union, and power politics. Yet the two are in essential agreement on international coöperation.

In spite of this common ground, a *rapprochement* seems unlikely as long as the present leadership continues. The existence of two labor parties in New York is another manifestation of the schism which divides organized labor in America today. More than that, a deep cleavage has resulted from the two groups' diverse attitudes and tactics toward the Communists. In this respect, there is some resemblance to the struggle between the International Federation of Trade Unions and the newly projected World Trade Union Congress. The latter, sponsored by the CIO and Soviet trade unions, was seen by the IFTU as a fruitless and harmful attempt to bring together "irreconcilable totalitarian and democratic groupings" which "would subordinate the American labor movement . . . to the dictates of the will of those who themselves are not free to determine their destiny."[33] Some profess to see in the Labor-Liberal split a miniature of the world-wide struggle today between totalitarian socialism and democratic socialism, a socialism of a ruling proletariat as compared to a socialism of a broader base. This interpretation seems unfair to the CIO unions now controlling the ALP, and whose loyalty to democratic processes is unquestioned. However, in June, 1945, the Communists dropped Earl Browder and proceeded to adopt a new militant Marxist program under the leadership of William Z. Foster.[34] If the Communists do not revive their own party, they may try to capture the ALP and turn it into a party of totalitarian socialism; although it seems doubtful whether such a scheme could succeed.

For the moment, these broader considerations are unlikely to govern the future of the two parties. President Truman and the New Deal and the relationship between Governor Dewey and the Republicans will be more important factors; for opportunism is still a basic policy of the new labor politics. Irrespective of unification, the American Labor and Liberal parties should continue to be a pivotal force in New York politics.

[33] *New York Times*, May 11, 1945. For a useful statement on the position of the American Federation of Labor on this problem, see William Green, "The AFL and World Labor Unity," *International Postwar Problems*, II, 285–292 (July, 1945). The IFTU was dissolved on December 15, 1945.

[34] This new line was inspired in large part by the suggestions of the French Communist leader, Jacques Duclos. On the changes in Communist tactics, see *New York Times*, June 5, July 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1945, and *PM*, July 23, 1945.

POLITICS AND ETHICS—A SYMPOSIUM*

I. POLITICS, SCIENCE, AND ETHICS

GABRIEL A. ALMOND
Brooklyn College

I

The recent polemic in the pages of this REVIEW between William F. Whyte and John Hallowell on the relations between politics and ethics raises a familiar and long-standing controversy. Whyte challenges political scientists in the spirit of "scientific detachment" from man's aspirations and strivings, a point of view which attempts to equate the man who follows science as his vocation with science itself. Those aspirations and values which condition and influence the scientist's work, but which are not properly a part of the scientific apparatus, are disposed of as a pastry cook treats that part of the pie dough which does not fit in the tin. Hallowell's reply attacks the logical fallacies of Whyte's argument and discusses some of the implications of this point of view.

It is always justifiable to renew an old controversy if there have been new findings and insights which contribute to a clarification of the issues. The researches and discoveries of the social and psychological sciences during the past decades have thrown some new light on the relations between rationality, science, and ethics. It is rather to bring these findings more sharply to bear upon the controversy than in any spirit of disagreement with the arguments of Hallowell that this article has been written.

It may be well before proceeding to the main discussion to review briefly the "challenge" of Whyte, and the reply of Hallowell, in order that the progression of the polemic may be clear to the reader. Whyte's arguments may be summarized in the following three points: (1) Too large a proportion of the energies of the political science profession is directed toward the relatively unimportant areas of legal and governmental institutions, and political philosophy. Contrariwise, too little energy is directed toward the study of "informal political processes." (2) More direct contact with politics and politicians is necessary in order to describe the political process adequately. (3) Political scientists "... should leave ethics to the philosophers and concern themselves primarily with the description and analysis of political behavior."

* Two articles published in this REVIEW a year or two ago stirred a considerable amount of discussion. The first was William F. Whyte, "A Challenge to Political Scientists" (Vol. 37, pp. 692–697, Aug., 1943). The second, by way of a reply, was John H. Hallowell, "Politics and Ethics" (Vol. 38, pp. 639–655, Aug., 1944). Presented herewith are two new discussions of the issues involved, together with a further exchange of views between the original authors. MAN. ED.

We can agree with Whyte's second point without much qualification. Political scientists can, no doubt, learn much from the social anthropologist, and acquire more understanding of political processes through a greater stress on field research in practical politics. But with regard to his first point Whyte appears to be in error, largely because of an ambiguous definition of "politics." There probably has been a disproportionate concentration on legal and administrative problems in political science, but to view these areas as unimportant reflects a regrettable naïveté. One can hardly understand political processes without knowledge of the legal and institutional framework which political movements and pressures are intended to influence. Certainly political processes do not stop at the point where legal and formal political institutions begin. The political process in the narrow sense in which Whyte uses the term is only a part of a larger process. The "struggle for power and prestige" which Whyte views as the essence of politics includes the struggle to influence legislation, administration, and adjudication through which power and prestige and other values may be won. And much valuable work has been done, particularly in recent years, in demonstrating how various types of groups and organizations influence these formal governmental processes.

But it is in his third point that Whyte opens himself to the sharpest criticism. He urges political scientists " . . . to leave ethics to the philosophers and concern themselves primarily with the description and analysis of political behavior." If all Whyte means here is that the value judgments of the political scientists should not be permitted to bias his research and analysis, then there can be no quarrel with him. But one gathers that he means more than this, although, unfortunately, this part of his argument is implicit. He appears to mean that the political scientist should have no ethical purpose animating his work. Thus in an era such as the present he should not be spending his time writing about democracy. Also in his studies of political organization he should not be concerned with eliminating political corruption. Even the description of certain political phenomena as "corruption" Whyte views as a product of the "middle class prejudice" of the political scientist. The manner in which he develops this argument reveals the limitations of his point of view. He endeavors to demonstrate that corruption is neither "good" nor "bad," since machine politics constitutes a channel of advancement for immigrant groups who are at a disadvantage in competition in business and the professions as compared with the more established elements of the population. Consequently, political corruption, though "bad" from the point of view of the "middle classes," may be "good" from the point of view of the immigrant classes of the population. Had Whyte been less inhibited on the score of values and ethical judgments, he might have asked himself whether corruption is really "good" for the immigrant classes. And

he might have discovered, as others have discovered before him, that while corruption might be good for those who profit from it, only the merest crumbs in the form of favors and pauperizing charity reach the immigrant masses. Thus he might have concluded that corruption is a totally inadequate way of bringing "power and prestige" to the urban immigrant masses as compared with an efficiently administered system of social legislation and an effectively functioning economy which would assure opportunity to the population as a whole.

In general, Whyte's position with regard to the relation between science and ethics is a product of that "scientificism" which has exercised an unfortunate influence upon the social sciences, particularly since the last war. Hallowell points out quite well that it is an evasion of the scientist's responsibility as a man, even though it parades itself as the only genuine scientific manliness. This concern with detachment and the avoidance of all valuation should not be confused with the scientist's honest concern for objectivity and the methods which are most likely to produce objective results. This unwillingness to be emotionally moved by the conflicts and injustices which move the people whom science is supposed to serve is responsible for those great products of scientific virtuosity which impress the reader or the listener as he might be momentarily impressed by a gifted pianist's playing of a series of cadenzas. Cadenzas are not music. And great displays of methodological or dialectical skill are not science. If science is not to become this type of sterile virtuosity, it must be animated by purpose and devoted to service.

II

Here we are only at the beginning of the problem, and since it is at this point that Whyte and Hallowell join argument, it might be well to summarize the latter's remarks. The summary, of course, does not do justice to the original. He argues: (1) Scientists are continually making value judgments. Behind every work of science, for example, there is an act of choice which rests upon some kind of value determination. Scientists assume the existence of an order of nature, the laws of which can be derived by scientific inquiry and method; (2) The scientific trend represented by Whyte assumes that men are essentially irrational. (Whyte has nowhere stated this explicitly. Hallowell endeavors to refute this by the argument that the scientist who advances this doctrine assumes that he and his readers or listeners are capable of rationality.)

Hallowell's first argument does not in any essential way affect Whyte's position. Whyte might admit that his choice of a problem, even his choice of science as a profession, involves choice or evaluation. He might also admit the metaphysical assumption that there is an order of nature. And still he could assert that the scientist should leave ethics and morals to

the philosophers and theologians and confine himself to the analysis of political behavior. It is Hallowell's second point which is the crucial one. For if, as Whyte may believe, human behavior is essentially irrational, then ethical judgments on the part of the scientist are irrelevant. If men are moved by internal and external forces over which they have no control, then social movements and action are mere blind struggles to which neither the scientist nor the philosopher can make a rational or ethical contribution. But Whyte cannot maintain this and at the same time make any claim to rationality himself. His only way out of this dilemma would be to assert that only a small minority, an élite, is capable of rationality. And this position has, as a matter of fact, been urged by persons who have taken a position similar to that of Whyte. Science then comes to have meaning only to the scientist and the small group capable of understanding and utilizing it. It can be of use in enabling him to predict future developments and thereby improve or protect his own position. If Whyte wishes to maintain this "élite" point of view, it is up to him to furnish proof.

The question of man's (and the scientist's) capacity for rationality is the key to the entire argument. For if men are incapable of rationality, they are incapable of ethical behavior, since ethical action is a species of rational action. But neither of our writers has dealt with the question of rationality in any detail. It is here that newer discoveries and insights have thrown light on an age-old controversy.

In a limited sense, all men are capable of rationality if we understand by rationality the capacity to select means leading to desired ends. Any act of conscious choice of an effective means to an end is a rational act. The extent to which this mode of action is employed by individuals, and in different cultures, varies to a considerable degree. In some cultures, for example, traditional action plays a far greater rôle than in our own. In traditional action, not only the ends but the means as well are fixed by custom. But in our culture rational action plays an extremely important rôle. The very facts of social mobility attest to a multitude of conscious choices between means to various ends. And in private life the greater freedom of choice in marriage, in friendship, in housing, occupation, hobbies, and in a host of other relationships and activities reflects the increasing importance of this mode of action in our lives. So that it can hardly be argued in simple terms that men are essentially irrational. The truth of the matter would appear to be that men are both rational and irrational, and typically both at the same time.

The type of rationality which we have been discussing might be called "means rationality." That is, conscious intelligent choice is limited to the action leading to the end or value, and only in a minor way affects the value itself. The value may be the product of "instinct" or "impulse."

Rationality may enter into the definition of the value. Typically, all of these and other factors enter into value determination. For example, the value of economic success is a product of tradition. One concentrates his energies toward money-making, because it is the "thing to do." An individual also endeavors to "make money" for the things and satisfactions money can buy. At the same time, one competes with others in "money-making" for the joy of emulation or competition, which some claim has an "instinctive" basis.

However, when the element of rationality or conscious evaluation or choice significantly enters into the definition and determination of the values themselves, we are dealing with a different type of rationality. We might call it "means-end" rationality, or to use Karl Mannheim's expression, "substantial rationality,"[1] or to use a more commonplace expression which has much the same meaning, "enlightened self-interest." An illustration may serve to define this concept more effectively than a formal definition. We might take as examples the contemporary actions of farmers, laborers, and industrialists directed toward breaking the existing price ceilings for their products or services. Through their organizations, they may direct their energies in a formidably rational manner toward attempting to create that kind of public opinion, and that attitude among public officials, which will permit increases in the particular wages or prices with which they are concerned. The members of the trade union or association may gain an immediate advantage by this means. But should their conduct become generalized, as it is likely to be if they are successful, the short-run advantage would be lost, and a new spiral in the inflationary process would be set in motion. It is only too true, of course, that the consequences of this type of conduct always involve more than those guilty of the responsible actions, and frequently do not immediately and directly affect the guilty at all. But in the long run retribution of a kind comes home to roost. For example, a serious inflation might be a contributing factor to a serious depression which would mean, in effect, unemployment for many laborers and bankruptcy for many farmers and business men. Even worse consequences may in the long run flow from these earlier and later irrational actions, for economic catastrophe breeds movements of political dissatisfaction and desperation. These in turn might lead to excessive nationalism in our foreign policy which might contribute to another world conflict. So that in a sense men who have sought their own short-run interests in what appeared to be "innocent" matters may in the long run bear a share in the responsibility for a renewal of the bloodshed and the costs of war.

[1] Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society in the Age of Reconstruction* (New York, 1940), p. 51 ff.

What we are dealing with, then, when we speak of "substantial rationality," or "enlightened self-interest," is the use of intelligent choice in the determination of the ends of action as well as in the choice of means. It is, in effect, the capacity to anticipate consequences of action, and to employ the most adequate means in evaluating alternatives. And this leads us logically to our next problem. Under what conditions are men capable of using the most adequate means in evaluating alternative courses of action?

The capacity for "substantial rationality" rests upon a combination of internal and external conditions. From the point of view of individual psychology, there must be relative freedom from unconscious compulsion. It is to the credit of Freud and his followers that they demonstrated the rôle played by unconscious feelings in human conduct. Many students of psychological problems have long given up the Freudian theory that underlying all human conduct are the libidinal and the death instincts or any other combination of definite "basic instincts." From this point of view, for which no satisfactory proof has ever been offered, all behavior is basically irrational or non-rational. Scientific curiosity and interest become "voyeurism," scientific method "anal preoccupation," and the like. All human values are translatable in these terms of the libidinal instinct, or the instinct of destruction, or both in combination. There can be no question of freeing the intellect from the compulsion of these instincts. All values are reduceable to these terms. These unproved hypotheses of Freud and some of his followers have exercised an unfortunate influence on the development of the social sciences. They have proved supports to the attitude of some social scientists that social conflicts are the products of the incurable irrationality of man, and that science can play no rôle in their constructive resolution.

More recent trends in psychology have discarded the biological bias and the instinct theory of Freud, but have retained the concept of the unconscious, and the therapeutic tools developed by psychoanalysis. As defined by such a psychoanalyst as Karen Horney,[2] the unconscious becomes the nervous and emotional "set" acquired by persons through all the influences which have been brought to bear upon them, particularly in the formative period of childhood. Instead of reducing all the traits and tendencies inherent in the biology of man to two "instincts," the assumption is made that man has a variety of biological potentialities, the ends of which are more or less independently valid, and not necessarily derivable from any "basic instincts." Thus the desire of the individual to understand what goes on around him, to act in such a manner as to gain satisfactions of various kinds without impairing his safety, become independently valid ends of action, and not just sublimations of more

[2] Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (New York, 1937), and *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1939).

primitive trends. But as this later psychological tendency is careful to point out, this capacity for what we call rational behavior is only a *potentiality*. Its realization is dependent upon the emotional and nervous condition of the individual. For example, a person who has been rejected in early family life, whose formative years have been spent in a relatively hostile emotional atmosphere, and who has adjusted to this situation by developing into a resentful, withdrawn character, will hardly be capable of thoroughgoing rational behavior in adult life. For in every situation which he meets he will bring his hostile tendencies with him. The efforts which he may make toward friendship, love, occupational satisfaction and success, will be colored by his underlying negative, resentful feelings which will render all of these actions irrational and self-defeating. For, in the field of friendship, one cannot hate and distrust men and at the same time bring them to be fond of one's self, however lonely and needy of response one may become. One can tie persons to one's self by bonds of interest or fear; one can strike up a partnership of resentment with persons of similar tendency; but one cannot win that kind of non-instrumental warmth and affection which all men seek, though many in a twisted and perverse manner. Should such a person seek to make a judgment of a public policy, his choice would be similarly irrational. He would necessarily assume hostility in others. His own feelings would become universal objective data, for an important part of the evidence of how others feel is how we ourselves feel. If such a person should happen to be an industrialist faced with a labor dispute, he would enter the controversy with conflicting ends. On the one hand, as the owner of his enterprise, he would be interested in having a satisfied and productive labor force. On the other hand, as a person motivated by unconscious hostility and resentment, he would be under compulsion to injure and dominate others. Needless to say, under these circumstances an unsatisfactory irrational result would ensue.

In other words, substantially rational behavior is dependent upon a clean and straight intellectual and emotional instrument. It must not be clogged with powerful feelings which are irrelevant to the objective action. There must be an "inner freedom to choose." In positive terms, one must be open to evidence. One must have the capacity to select a policy or an end after having carefully explored the various alternatives and their possible consequences. Necessarily, one will make errors. We can be sure that men will never be able to predict consequences with absolute precision. One can ever strive to perfect the rationality of one's conduct. But rational perfection (which from one point of view is synonymous with ethical perfection) is like beauty—ever beckoning, but ever inaccessible.

In general, the type of character which is capable of substantial rationality is the product of an emotional development in which compulsion has

played a minimal rôle. From a positive point of view, it is the product of a constructive fostering of intellectual potentialities which respects the integrity and peculiar qualities of the individual. But this accounts only for the subjective apparatus of rationality, and action involves an objective context. A "proper upbringing" produces only a willingness and a capacity to weigh alternative courses of action. But the execution of a rational action is dependent upon knowledge and understanding of the context of the action.

It was the achievement of Karl Marx that he demonstrated the importance of position in the social structure for the formation of judgments about social phenomena. But as Freud and his followers rode their biological theory out of bounds, Marx and his followers were similarly extremist with their sociological theory. Just as in the case of Freud the individual was defined as the helpless tool of his instincts, so in the case of Marx the individual was defined as the helpless victim of his class interest.[3] Not only this, but the dominant class interest in a society biased the entire apparatus of communication and knowledge, so that a genuine social science (at least in a "class society") was impossible. Although some students of social phenomena continue to operate on the assumptions of Marx, some of his constructive insights have been assimilated into the various disciplines. Social scientists now generally recognize that economic and other "interests" bias the judgment of men in general, scientists included. Similarly, many of them recognize that the content of communication is biased by the economic and other interests of those who control the various media. But it is quite a distance from the point of view which holds that economic interest *determines* judgments of social policy to the point of view which holds that these and other interests *affect* such judgments.

We have therefore learned that the data concerning the objective context in which political and social action is fulfilled are biased. But it is difficult to see why persons, where certain conditions are met, cannot correct this bias. In the United States, for example, the means of communication are so numerous and varied in their ownership and direction that it is relatively simple to "correct" for what has been omitted or distorted in the dominant media of communication. It is true, for example, that trade unionists are at the mercy of the press and radio for up to the minute news of labor activity and problems. But any one-sided interpretation can be overcome by direct communication in trade union meetings, or in the labor press. Similarly, bias in the special labor media of communication may be corrected in the non-labor media which reach the trade union as well as the general public. So that the constructive con-

[3] Cf. Charles E. Merriam, *The Rôle of Politics in Social Change* (New York, 1936), p. 13 ff.

tribution of Marx and others who have dealt with these problems is the recognition of the difficulties of forming objective judgments in a situation in which various "interests" color, select, and distort the evidence which is required if the judgment is to be sound. There is sufficient evidence to prove that not only a "scientific élite," but the rank and file of the population as well, can resist the pressures of propaganda in the dominant conservatively controlled media of communication. As long as the media of communication are sufficiently competitive, rational judgment and action is possible, even though it is rendered more difficult of achievement in a situation of semi-monopolistic control of the more important media in some areas.

Rational judgment and action become possible, then, (1) when the persons involved have an emotional clarity of purpose, and (2) when the correct data concerning the objective context in which the action is to take place are available. A third precondition which has not been stressed here is the factor of skill in the analysis and interpretation of data. Needless to say, there may be clarity of purpose, and correct data, but if skill and experience in evaluating and organizing data are lacking, action may be irrational. One has only to discuss political issues with small children to realize the importance of experience and skill in reasoning and evaluating information in the larger areas of social organization and policy. At the same time, discussion of political issues with small children may similarly illustrate the importance of emotional soundness and clarity, for though they may frequently come out with irrational answers, they sometimes ask disturbingly rational questions. But there is no point in the compass of so brief an article to attempting more than to refer to the problems of skill and method. To the extent that the above conditions are met, men are capable of that kind of rationality which involves not only the intelligent selection of means, but the intelligent evaluation and modification of ends as well.

III

In the contribution of Whyte, political science and ethics are treated as discreet disciplines, having no apparent relationship to one another. Although this is challenged by Hallowell, it will be useful to undertake a further elaboration. The relationship of science to ethics is not the same for all scientific disciplines. The physical[4] and biological sciences, although oriented toward the values of truth and usefulness, are ordinarily not as sciences concerned with problems of public policy. But for the social sci-

[4] This was written before Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The physical scientists these days are deeply involved in problems of public policy, but in a quite different sense from the social scientist. The physicist is not concerned with public policies as scientific data, but as factors affecting his freedom of research. He also views with a growing sense of urgency the effect of his findings on public policy.

ences, and particularly political science, public policy is a primary datum. For the struggles of groups and individuals for control over the instruments of public authority is not only a struggle for power among the leading competitors, but a struggle for public policy. Power, aside from its own satisfactions, is as means to the ends of public policy. The social and political scientist is as much concerned with the analysis of the consequences of different types of public policy as he is concerned with the means employed in the formulation of the policy. And in the analysis of the consequences of the policy it is certainly his job to judge whether a particular policy which has been justified as leading in some manner to the public good actually does so. In this connection, and in specific reply to Whyte, it should be pointed out that the philosopher lacks the knowledge and skill required to deal with these "ethical" problems, while the political scientist, if he is properly trained, has the necessary competence. Rather than leaving "ethics" to the philosophers (who are concerned with these problems only in a doctrinal-historical or logical sense), practical judgment of "good and evil" in the area of public policy is the special responsibility of the social scientist.

There is no reason why a political scientist who has come to a conclusion that a particular public policy may have dangerous consequences should not make himself articulate on the subject. And if his feelings are strong, there is no reason why he should not become a warm advocate. And there is no reason why warm advocacy and cool objectivity cannot commingle in the same lecture, article, or book. It is true that on the academic platform advocacy is not in place; but the analysis of the consequences of various courses of action is an essential function.

Basically, the reason why the political scientist should be concerned with the consequences of public policy, and particularly with whether the consequences are "good or bad," is that he is a man and partakes of the fate of men. The capacity for warm-hearted sympathy for the fate of individuals, or for groups of men, or for mankind in general, is in no way in conflict with the capacity for scientific objectivity. If his reactions are "healthy," he will be concerned with just these problems which are the matters of social controversy. He will be concerned with the most rational (and therefore the most ethical) solutions of these problems. In the laboratory or in the class-room, he will necessarily operate under the rules of academic freedom which involve a responsibility commensurate with the powers which being on a platform and having an academic status yield. But if he is capable of effective demagogy on the "hustings," where demagogy and not science is in order, then let him speak with whatever eloquence and feeling he can command for the cause which he considers to be good.

Even if the social scientist is unmoved by the events which move his contemporaries (and there are some of us who suffer from this kind of anaesthesia), he may not evade the service which is exacted from him in exchange for his privileges. If not feeling, then "expediency" will indicate that his work must be of some use to his community. It must be related to the community's interests or needs. To be sure, some scientists devote their work to the service of particular "interests," since this yields them the income and prestige with which they are most concerned. They may gain immediate satisfaction and advantage through this means, but by so violating their scientific integrity they bring discredit upon their profession, themselves included. And even in the short run one who perverts his knowledge and skill for the service of a special interest forfeits his right to the highest satisfaction which the pursuit of science can offer—the self-esteem and joy of craftsmanship and creation which only honest work may yield.

If, then, public policy is a primary datum of political science, by what means can that discipline contribute to the success of "good" policy, and the defeat of "bad"?[5] Science cannot create values; these grow out of the needs and aspirations of the people. It can, however, demonstrate how and to what extent alternative public policies contribute to the realization of public values and aspirations. It is a cliché to observe that all groups can agree upon ends if they are stated with sufficient generality. Controversy arises over the question as to which means are the most efficient in leading to these ends. And here the political scientist and his collaborators in the other social science disciplines can perform a useful function in judging the relative efficiency and applicability of means. The political scientist may also play a useful rôle in evaluating the consequences of realizing one value or set of values for other values, and thereby make the consequences of particular political choices clear. It is only when those who exercise public power are capable of determining the efficiency of alternative means, and the compatibility of ends, that rationality in public policy formation becomes possible. The political scientist, by virtue of his training, is qualified to make a contribution toward rendering policy formation more rational—that is, genuinely meet the needs and aspirations of the public. In this sense, his function is an essentially ethical one. For it is his task to discover the pathway to "good" ends. And desiring and influencing so that the "right path" to the "good end" is taken, far from being in conflict with his duty as a scientist, is the very essence of his responsibility as a scientist and a man.

[5] Cf. Max Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1922), particularly "Wissenschaft als Beruf."

II. POLITICAL PROCESSES AND JUDGMENTS OF VALUE

LEWIS A. DEXTER
Bryn Mawr College

The articles by Messrs. Whyte and Hallowell in this REVIEW in August, 1943, and August, 1944, are valuable, because they document a controversy which, though common enough among social scientists, is more often conducted orally than in writing. Analysis of their articles will, I believe, show that the controversy arises out of incompletely examined methodological and ethical postulates, and that, if these postulates are clarified, the function of the political scientist may become more evident.

A central point at issue is found in Whyte's assertion that "political scientists should leave ethics to the philosophers and concern themselves primarily with the description and analysis of political behavior" (p. 697) and Hallowell's rejoinder that the "amoral description of dirty politics . . . encourages in practice the kind of politics that may eventually destroy the very possibility of a scientific and objective study of politics, wholly aside from the injustice and misery such politics brings in its wake to all individuals, whether students of politics or not" (p. 654).

Each of these propositions is, in its consequences, self-contradictory. Whyte justifies himself by maintaining that political scientists should devote themselves to the discovery of uniformities (p. 693). Note the word "should." (With the exception of an occasional argument that science is an aesthetic enterprise, which is obviously not Whyte's contention nor that of those who agree with him), the defense of scientific endeavor has usually been in terms of "should," that is, has usually been, remotely or immediately, ethical. Whyte himself quotes the *Nichomachean Ethics* (p. 692) to the effect that political scientists *should be* prepared to teach the arts of political success as the painter teaches the arts of painting. He says that "unquestioning acceptance of democratic ideology" handicaps political science research; and he adds that the political scientist must "recognize *explicitly* that he is dealing with a stratified society and discover some *systematic* way of dealing with politics" (p. 695, italics mine).

Right here is a contradiction. The successful practicing politician in the United States today must explicitly *deny* the inequality of political strata, even though he implicitly admits it; and thinkers like Hague, Langone, Plunkitt, or even Steffens, Salter, Kent, and Catlin are not systematic in the same sense as Hobbes, Lasswell, Locke, Machiavelli, and Merriam. In other words, Whyte is not really interested in teaching the arts of practical success, as such; he is concerned with systematic political

science, because he is interested in some form of scientific truth.

On the other hand, the only way Hallowell could prove his contention that the "amoral description of dirty politics encourages in practice the kind of politics that may eventually destroy the very possibility of a scientific and objective study of politics" (p. 654) is by making an empirical, amoral analysis. Suppose someone challenges his assertion! How can he defend himself convincingly? He must make an analysis of empirical facts. He will find himself constrained to report, not what he likes, but what, so far as he can tell, really did happen. In other words, he must eliminate his own preferences from the description; and thus he will be amorally analyzing dirty politics. This is a variant of the old dilemma, "No one can refuse to be a philosopher, for, in giving his reasons for not philosophizing, he becomes a philosopher."

The foregoing paragraphs concentrate upon the weaker, rather than the stronger, portions of both articles, because it is where the analysis is incomplete that the differences of opinion are sharpest, and, for general political science methodology, most important. Actually, the contradictions would not have arisen if the authors had made explicit some points which they presumably recognize implicitly. Hallowell, for instance, protests against "limiting" political science to "a description of political techniques." This bears directly upon the crucial issue.

Judgments of value *are* relevant to the process of political analysis. But judgments of value should not be permitted to control reports or predictions.

Now, what do these assertions mean for the practicing political scientist? First, in the selection of problems for investigation, he may take judgments of value into account. The nineteenth-century conception of the scientist as someone who simply went around looking for something interesting to discover, or as someone who knows intuitively what it is important to find out, are both unrelated to the achievement of maximum public service by scientists. On the contrary, we have an obligation to ourselves and to the community to make clear why we study what we study. There are, incidentally, a considerable number of articles published each year in which it is difficult to ascertain what purpose the writer thought he was serving, if any.

A hit-or-miss selection of problems is likely to lead us to tackle the trivial or insoluble; and unless we are able to explain why we are studying what we are studying, colleagues, superiors, and associates cannot judge whether funds and facilities should be allowed us or not. Indeed, the notion that the selection of problems for research can be undertaken on a random basis is very similar to the notion of that invisible hand which led entrepreneurs to serve the public best while following their private

interests.[1] In the economic field, the notion encouraged the slum and the plow that broke the plains; in intellectual spheres, its results have not been entirely satisfactory.

The difficulty has been to get any widely acceptable criteria of worthwhile effort. The notion that it is five minutes to twelve, so that we should not study navigation while the ship is going down, is not very helpful. It simply converts the political philosopher into a publicist. And concentration upon matters of immediate concern probably prevents the scientist from rendering his greatest service. Generalizations which are applicable to a variety of situations and have a high degree of reliability and validity are, presumably, more useful than the solution of an immediate engineering or mechanical problem. Lundberg has said:

> "There is a real danger that an overly-practical and short-sighted policy in this respect might dry up the very fountain-heads of scientific advance through a failure to support adequately more 'esoteric' researches into theoretical and mathematical questions, which have always been the conditions of progress in science.
>
> "In times of public excitement, especially, there are likely to be outcries from 'practical men,' reformers, and even some poets, as proponents of 'action' against 'lecturing on navigation while the ship is going down.' It is because some men went about their proper business . . . that we know something about navigation today. The researches and the lectures survived and were found useful on other ships on which, however different from the ships that sank, men found life quite tolerable and navigation greatly improved. . . .
>
> "In short, we may resolve the controversy between contenders for 'practical' research and the 'truth-for-truth's' sake contingent somewhat as follows: The 'intellectual' is on sound ground when he stresses (a) the need of freedom in science to follow curiosities which have . . . a very remote and hypothetical relation to the problems that may be agitating the contemporary world, (b) the indirect significance to 'practical' problems of such freedom. . . . Scientists and other intellectuals are, on the other hand, on unsound and unrealistic ground if and when they contend for freedom to follow their curiosity or 'truth for truth's sake' *as an end in itself rather than as a means to ends in which the larger community has a stake. . . .*"[2]

From this standpoint, Whyte's approach is ethically more defensible than Hallowell's because Whyte is attempting to develop generalizations which will be useful, not only in the present crisis, but in the future. Unfortunately, however, Whyte, in common with a number of others who champion long-range scientific research, puts himself in the position of rejecting ethical considerations in the choice of problems for scientific investigation; whereas it would be more accurate to say that the "pure"

[1] For discussions of *laissez-faire* in the intellectual realm, see Robert Lynd, *Knowledge for What* (Princeton, 1937); David Riesman, Jr., "Civil Liberties in a Period of Transition," *Public Policy Yearbook* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), 32–98; and my "Civil Liberties in a Twentieth Century World," in Z. Chafee, Jr., *et al.*, *Censorship in Time of Crisis* (out of print), Civil Liberties Committee of Massachusetts, 1941.

[2] George A. Lundberg, *Social Research* (New York, 1942), pp. 32–33.

scientific approach involves a rather different and equally valid ethical emphasis, an emphasis which most men neglect, because of the desire to serve some immediate need.[3]

In other words, the political scientist may be rendering the greatest possible service if he concentrates his attention upon the formulation of valid generalizations about political behavior, regardless of immediate crises. And generalizations about political behavior are valid precisely as and if they are part of an organized theory of human behavior. This may take the political scientist a long way from his base; he might find his field illuminated by the application of sociometric techniques to a street corner gang[4] or of higher mathematics to international relations.[5]

There is a second area where value judgments are relevant to the analysis of politics. Whether values be regarded as prime movers or epiphenomena in the intricate pattern of interhuman relations, they must, somehow, be taken into account. The scholar ordinarily asks himself the question: Shall I evaluate that which I study or shall I refrain from evaluating?

The ordinary tendency is to answer these questions either yes or no. Logically, however, it is possible to answer: sometimes yes, sometimes no. Actually this is the most reasonable position. So long as the scholar is concerned with the determination of hypotheses, of facts, of probabilities, he must judge without reference to evaluation. When the proposition is so stated, there are few who would deny it; but many attempt to evade or circumvent its application. They want comfort. They want security. They want reassurance. These presumably desirable goals often interfere with accurate prediction and analysis.

To give an obvious example: a man with a weak heart may perhaps be protected from knowledge of his condition. But his physician should never fool himself. He may find it necessary to advise the man as to precautions, to help him to divest himself of responsibilities. Professionally, also, the social scientist has an obligation to see what is as it is "no matter how . . . charged with punishment the scroll." He may believe that war should not come; but he should not, like many of us in 1934, believe that war will not come. He may believe world government is essential; but he must not

[3] Kenneth Burke has indicated the process by which the "pure" scientist needlessly puts himself in the unstrategic position of opposing morality in *Attitudes Towards History* (New York, 1937), "Stealing Back and Forth of Symbols," II, 229–230. Sinclair Lewis, in *Arrowsmith*, Chaps. 21–25, shows his hero as unethical, because he permits himself to try to save lives rather than to develop a controlled experiment.

[4] L. S. Cottrell, Jr., and Ruth Gallagher, have summarized much relevant literature, in *Developments in Social Psychology, 1930–1940* (Beacon, New York).

[5] Lewis F. Richardson, "Generalized Foreign Politics," *British Journal of Psychology*, Suppl. Monog. XXIII (Cambridge, Eng., 1939).

conceal from himself the difficulties of achieving it.[6] When writing in professional journals, such as this one, where the major concern is with the validity and reliability and generality of statements, there is no occasion for a scientist to stress his own preferences. In selecting and planning scientific research, the scientist has an obligation to suppress his own personal preferences if they conflict in any way with the most valuable scientific approach.

An illustration may clarify my view here. Last year, I was made responsible for the organization of a social science research center, with a projected appropriation of $360,000, at the University of Puerto Rico. Now, the major problems of Puerto Rico about which government officials and politically active citizens are concerned are two—political status (independence versus dominion status versus colonialism versus statehood) and economic development through industrialization and rationalization. However, it became evident to me that most thinking and planning on both these topics were guided by parallels derived from "Anglo-Saxon" and Northwestern European cultures. The underlying personality type of the Puerto Rican is such, his basic attitudes and values are of a sort, which make it difficult, if not impossible, to impose Yankee standards of industrial and marketing efficiency upon him. Accordingly, I felt that the greatest contribution which a university research center could make to the welfare of the island was to analyze the culture of Puerto Rico, preferably through the basic personality type method of analysis developed by Kardiner, Linton, and Kluckhohn. The elaborate and ambitious planning program will, I believe, fail in attaining its objectives, because it is not adapted to the authentic spirit of the Puerto Rican people: a cultural study of the sort I proposed might permit the organization of planning more effectively.

The other problem on which I thought the research center should concentrate was that of population. Puerto Rico is one of the most densely populated areas in the world, and its population is increasing at the rate of about two and one-half per cent a year. It seems that any economic approach which does not involve some method of handling this increase is based upon a very unsteady foundation. And, unless these economic questions can be solved, political independence or dominion status or statehood is of secondary importance.

Nevertheless, the proposals which I submitted were criticized and ultimately rejected on precisely the grounds on which Hallowell bases his argument. Puerto Rico is facing a crisis; now is the year of destiny; any research which does not help us directly in solving that crisis is irrelevant and immaterial. Finally, it was decided to concentrate on problems which

[6] See my "Implications of Supranational Federation," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 7, pp. 400–406 (1942).

are trivial (because the answers are already known) or irresoluble (because we do not have the basic information which would make their resolution possible). In the long run, the concern with immediacy is going to mean that the people of Puerto Rico will receive less aid from their University than they have a right to expect.[7]

Whyte is correct in pointing out that good and evil are not useful categories for purposes of analysis (p. 694); but it is an illegitimate extrapolation to assume that these categories are useless for all other purposes. Indeed, any political scientist who writes for the general public, or teaches freshmen, ought to make the distinction between judgments of value and judgments of fact as clear as he can. But he ought also to remember that to the citizen the ethical aspects of politics are more important than the techniques of political control or analysis and that, where attention is focused exclusively upon the latter, citizens tend to believe that the end of political science is organization and power. Hallowell's conclusion that the citizenry itself will then adopt a completely amoral attitude is open to question; it is equally probable that they will reject all that the writer, or teacher, has to say. But, in either case, there is a failure of communication.

In other words, when the political scientist in our society writes with reference to projected or current action, he will be understood as employing the categories of good and evil. Indeed, at one level of any argument, these categories are necessarily present; for instance, when Whyte recommends that political scientists spend more time on "just plain politics" and less on classical political theory, he is saying that the former is relatively good and the latter relatively bad.

Hallowell, however, improperly assumes that because these categories are present at one level of an argument, they are or should be present at all levels. The real issue is: What does one wish to recommend to whom as good when? Or what will prospective readers understand as a consequence of what one says? Or what, if anything, will they do as a consequence of what one says? These questions cannot be answered in general terms, but only by means of an analysis of particular propositions in particular situations.[8] In some cases, for instance, it may be that "amoral analysis of dirty politics" is such as to lead to more dirty politics. In other situations, it may prepare people to relate ethical absolutes to the prac-

[7] One reason why I failed may be worth noting. I allowed myself to be maneuvered into a position where I appeared (like Whyte) to be defending "pure," that is esoteric, research for its own sake. Were I ever to encounter such a situation again, I would concentrate far more than I did on explaining what "basic" research is and why what I propose is basic.

[8] See Douglas Waples, Bernard Berelson, and Franklyn Bradshaw, *What Reading Does to People* (Chicago, 1940), which provides a framework for the analysis of such questions.

tical limitations of real life.[9] But the approach just indicated invalidates both Whyte's sweeping objection to the expression of political preferences by political scientists and Hallowell's sweeping defense of them.

Whyte's contention might be stated more modestly than he has formulated it: as a result of current political excitement, there is an undue neglect by political scientists of research directed towards the establishment of valid generalizations about political processes. Since in the long run, basic, theoretically oriented, research may be more significant than work stimulated by immediate crises, there is a moral obligation for political scientists to consider whether they ought not to undertake basic research, wherever such a possibility is open to them.

Since the majority of political scientists have been forced or have chosen to sacrifice basic research to war and postwar needs, those scholars who can may take Whyte's challenge to heart. And, since there are always immediate issues, whether of war or depression or elections or injustice or university administration, to draw us away from basic research, the challenge is a perennial one. No one of us can say, for certain, in advance, that he will continue basic research in preference to popular, hortatory writing, or administration, or politics itself; but he ought to be very clear that these other things are likely to exert considerable influence before he decides to spend his time on them.

To sum up: (1) social scientists necessarily make judgments of value; (2) the fact that they make judgments of value does not prevent them from making dispassionate, relatively "amoral," analyses of social problems; (3) judgments of value may be divided into two major types: (a) judgments about the selection of problems for study, and (b) judgments about political action; and (4) speaking generally, in our society, scientists should wherever possible concern themselves with the development of basic theory, rather than concentrate on practical problems, without theoretical importance. (The ideal problem is, of course, one having both theoretical and practical importance.) This last position is not defended as an ethical imperative. Its justification lies rather in the fact that the majority of scholars work on immediate, concrete problems. Therefore the minority which actually have a choice should choose to cultivate the kind of research which will make it easier to solve practical problems tomorrow than it is today.

[9] Maritain says that what a person with a rough idea of moral science may consider "contrary to virtue and morality may sometimes be the authentically moral behavior of a just man engaged in the complexities of human life and of true ethics." Quoted from his "End of Machiavellianism," *Review of Politics*, Jan., 1942, p. 5, by Charles McCoy, in "The Place of Machiavelli in the History of Political Thought," in this REVIEW, Vol. 37, p. 634, note (1943). Also, on this point see my "Be Not the First" (a discussion of the theory of compromise), *Journal of Liberal Religion*, Vol. 6, pp. 27–37 (Autumn, 1944).

Finally (5) laymen, however, listening to or reading a discussion of any political problem, expect the scholar to give a definite answer. Accordingly, we should always, before lecturing or publication, ask ourselves three questions: What do I wish to recommend to whom when? What will my prospective audience understand as a consequence of what I intend to say? What, if anything, will they be stimulated to do as a consequence of what I say? No general answer can be given to these questions; sometimes the scholar will find that he must explain his own practical preferences, and, at others, he must make clear that he has no intention of expressing his own opinions; always, however, he must guard against two dangers, that of succumbing to the temptation to exert influence rather than to clarify, and that of seeming unconcerned about the actual problems of humanity.

III. POLITICS AND ETHICS: A REPLY TO JOHN H. HALLOWELL

WILLIAM F. WHYTE
University of Chicago

"Politics and Ethics," in the August, 1944, issue of this journal, is presented by John H. Hallowell as an answer to "A Challenge to Political Scientists," which appeared here in August, 1943. I am glad to discover that my article aroused some interest among political scientists. If, in attacking my position, Dr. Hallowell had indicated that he understood what that position is, I should be content to let the case rest. However, it seems to me that he has simply set up a straw man upon which to use his ammunition.

In my article, I made these points: (1) political scientists should take an interest in politics; (2) they should study politics by becoming participant observers in political machines; and (3) they need to build up a conceptual scheme which permits them to analyze political behavior in terms of the social structure of our society.

In his article, Dr. Hallowell makes these points: (1) Whyte is a positivist; (2) positivists are against the use of conceptual schemes, without which data are meaningless; and (3) positivists would rule ethics out of the social sciences, and this is a bad thing.

As we compare these six points, it becomes difficult to believe that Dr. Hallowell read the article which he claims to be attacking. In the first place, I was not concerned with discussing the philosophy of science. My article was addressed to research men. My aim was to outline the methods and general approach which, I think, will lead to the development of fruitful research in the field of politics. Dr. Hallowell does not say whether

the methods of field research I propose are good or bad. He simply ignores them. Yet they are the heart of my article.

I wish therefore to redirect attention toward the research procedure I advocated in "A Challenge to Political Scientists." If there is to be any further discussion of that article, I hope it may revolve around those points and not get lost in the sterile field of social philosophy.

I also directed attention toward the object of study (p. 695): "If *organization* is the important thing that all politicians say it is, then it requires detailed and systematic study. We should want to take a particular organization and establish the relative positions of all its members within the hierarchy; we should want to observe the interactions of the members at the various levels so as to determine the functions of men at each level in the interactive system."

This does not mean, as Almond states, that I advocate studying only the informal relations of machine politics. It means that I advocate the study of human relations, whatever the political or governmental organization. The approach I set forth may be applied to a study of the United States Senate, the President and his cabinet, the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and so on, or even to a study of the United Nations Organization, in so far as the researcher can gain access to the necessary data. It is access to the data which provides the chief stumbling block for the study of these high level organizations; for a study of human relations in government should rely upon documents only in a very minor way. The most important data would come from close association with the members of these organizations, from observing them in their jobs, and from interviewing them upon their experiences in their organizations. It would be exceedingly difficult for any social scientist to build up close enough ties with the President, members of the Senate, and others in such high positions to enable him to make a close, first-hand study of the processes of government. Therefore, it is advisable, for purely practical considerations, to concentrate attention upon political processes at the local level, where contacts are more readily made and where the political scientist can study the social organization of the community as well as the political structure itself.

The social sciences have been handicapped by making a fetish of the study of written documents. Of course, the law as it stands on the books is a significant datum, and so is the collective bargaining contract signed by union and management; but in neither case will a reading of the documents cast much light upon the social processes that gave rise to them or upon the way the law or contract works out in the behavior of the people to whom it is intended to apply. To understand the legislative or collective bargaining process, we need to observe and interview the people in-

volved while the process is going on. For an understanding of human behavior, there is no substitute for interviewing and observation.

Concerning research procedure, this is my main contention: political scientists should get out *into the field* to study human relations in politics and government through interviewing and observation. If this is correct, then why is it not being done to any significant extent? If it is not correct, then I should like to hear the opposition arguments on this point.

Dr. Hallowell writes (p. 647): " . . . it is only by fitting the data made available to him by his senses into some preformulated conceptual scheme that the individual is able to perceive facts at all. Actually, then, when the positivist insists that to be properly scientific we must confine ourselves to a description of 'positive facts' that can be observed without transcending our immediate sensory experience, he is insisting upon the impossible."

I have yet to meet a social scientist who holds the position which Dr. Hallowell is here attacking. If, instead of pinning a label on me, he had read my article carefully, it would have been obvious to him that I did not hold such a position. In fact, I criticized the writings of the few political scientists who have been interested in politics on the ground that they have not had very well developed conceptual schemes, and I went on to indicate certain requirements in the building of a useful conceptual scheme. However, the real test is not whether I advocate the use of a conceptual scheme, but whether I actually do use one in research.

The conclusions set forth in my original article grew out of research experience, and I assumed that anyone who wanted to test the approach I use might have taken the trouble to look over some of the things I have published; for obviously the results obtained are the only real test of research methods. However, neither Hallowell nor Almond cared to pursue this matter. A large part of my book, *Street Corner Society* (University of Chicago Press), is devoted to an analysis of politics. If Dr. Hallowell is to make further comments upon my position, it would be well for him to read that book so that he will know what he is attacking.

Other political scientists have found that the data in this book are organized in terms of a conceptual scheme. For example, the review by Harry M. Johnson in the *Political Science Quarterly* (Vol. 59, pp. 318–19) puts it in this way: "The abundant first-hand data are presented . . . not as information but as evidence in support of generalization about the structure, functioning, and interrelationships of groups within the slum and about the relations of these groups with and to the community outside the slum. Deviant behavior and even neurotic symptoms are explained in terms of position in groups, group expectations, and conflicts of loyalty to different groups."

Now, Dr. Hallowell may dislike the conceptual scheme of *Street Corner Society*, but, if he reads the book, he can hardly deny that I have one. The issue is not, conceptual scheme or no conceptual scheme. It is, what kind of conceptual scheme?

I believe that the only useful sort of conceptual scheme in the social sciences is one made up of elements which are subject to first-hand observation and/or experimentation. The ethical values of the researcher do not meet this requirement, and therefore have no place in the scheme.

This does not mean, as Dr. Hallowell implies, that I have no scientific interest in what people believe in. I recognize, as he does, that the values held by people are an important dynamic factor in their behavior. I look upon the values of the people I study (discovered through interviewing and observation) as important research data. I feel that my own values have no place in my analysis of human behavior, and I try to disregard them as much as I possibly can.

That is a vital distinction to make. I can write objectively and scientifically about the values of the people I study. If I interpret other people's behavior in terms of my own values—the procedure followed by most political scientists—I am no longer a social *scientist*.

Of course, as both Almond and Dexter point out, the choice of a problem for study involves a value judgment. I am well aware of this. It certainly is not a matter of indifference to me what problem I study. However, once the choice has been made, I undertake as rigorously as I can to eliminate my value judgments in the research operations and in writing up my results.

By eliminating my value judgments, I do not mean that I simply go around calling "good" what other people consider "evil." Almond has misinterpreted my position on this point. I am not concerned with arguing that political corruption is good for the people of the slums or that it would be better than a program of social legislation. It is just such value judgments that I am arguing against.

I am suggesting that it is not the function of the scientist to judge between "good" and "evil" in his research operations. It is not up to him to say that political corruption is either good or bad. On the other hand, he should undertake to make objective studies of the processes of human relations that are involved in politics. It is not enough to take a quick look and shout "corruption," as so many political scientists have been doing. There is a pattern to politics, and it is the function of the scientist to study that pattern.

As for Hallowell's contention that the "amoral description of dirty politics" serves to encourage the development of such politics, I regard such a statement as so ridiculous that it hardly deserves an answer. Mayor Hague, Ed Kelly, and their colleagues do not turn to the writings

of political scientists to learn how to handle their organizations. They learn the ropes from experience, and, even if the writings of political scientists were much improved in this respect, we could not expect ward politicians to learn from the books. On the other hand, it is the respectable middle-class people who need to know how successful politicians operate, and it is just such knowledge that they do not find in the books. This does not mean that they have to learn to go around bribing people. There are certain uniformities to be observed in the successful handling of human relations, whether in ward politics or in other areas of activity. For example, I have interviewed a very successful politician who gained his position through establishing with Sunday school and church groups the same sort of human relations which the ward politicians build up with racketeers and street corner gangs. The groups of people involved were different, but the pattern of human relations was very much the same. However, if the student views politics through the blinders of "good" and "evil," he will never see these uniformities, and he will never learn to be skillful in politics. He may have very high ideals, but what does that matter if he does not have the skill to put them into practice?

On this subject, I can speak with the authority of considerable experience. I have seen a good many students improve their skills in handling human relations through following the approach I here advocate. They did not need preachments. They needed to learn to understand our society and to develop skills in handling human relations.

Almond's lengthy argument on emotion versus reason seems to me to require little comment. I agree that men typically govern their behavior by both reason and emotion. The weighting given each varies from person to person, but no one governs his behavior completely by reason, nor does any normal person govern his behavior completely by emotion. However, it is worth while to emphasize the emotional elements in behavior, because the orthodox economic and political theories tend to assume a rational man.

While I have been discussing the functions of political scientists as *scientists*, it may be well to comment upon the ethical values involved in such behavior. I do not take the art-for-art's sake position with regard to science. I feel that the ultimate justification of the social sciences rests with the practical values which arise through their study. Nor do I defend my work, as does Dexter, on the grounds that pure science, while of no immediate use, pays off somehow in the long run.

As a member of the Committee on Human Relations in Industry at the University of Chicago, I am up to my neck in research and experimentation which have immediate practical results as well as long-run utility. For example, I am at present supervising research and experimentation in a moderately large business organization. A man trained in

our research has taken a position as personnel manager of this company, and is making an effort to try out in practice some of the ideas developed in this research. The new personnel manager is trying to build up better coöperation among the various levels of authority, from bottom to top, and also to establish more harmonious union-management relations. In this company we have also placed a trained research person who is responsible only to the Committee on Human Relations in Industry. It is her job to follow very closely the efforts of the personnel manager and to keep a detailed record of the course of the experiment, based upon her observations and upon interviews with workers, supervisors, executives, and union officials. If the experiment is successful—if there are tangible results in improved coöperation—we shall know from this record every step in the process. And if it fails—as well it may—we shall know just how and why it failed. And then we shall be able to reformulate our ideas and begin again upon a sounder footing.

As we test out our ideas in this manner, we are concerned both with immediate practical results and also with long-run goals. If we learn how to make human relations adjustments on a small scale here and now, we can also establish the uniformities of human behavior which will enable us to give ever wider applications to the knowledge we gain. A number of other projects of the Committee on Human Relations in Industry are proceeding along the same lines.

Here it may seem that we are injecting values into our research; and that is true, with this important qualification. In our experiments, we assumed certain *ends* to be achieved. The ends are a matter of choice or value judgment. However, for the purposes of research they must be stated in such concrete form that, at the conclusion of the experiment, it will be possible to tell quite objectively whether or not they have been achieved. And, once the goal of the experiment has been set up, we rigorously exclude all value judgments from our research operations.

Following this approach, it would be quite legitimate for the political scientist to set forth his ends, providing he could give them precise definition, subject to operational tests. For example, suppose he wanted to test out ideas as to how the Catholic Church and the C.I.O. might be brought together in a *particular* campaign in a *particular* area.[1] Stating his problem in this way, he could readily determine in the course of the political campaign whether church and unions were working together or were fighting each other. However, if he states his ends in terms of "good government," "social welfare," or "the greatest good for the greatest number," as political scientists generally do, then he will never be able to test out his ideas in practice. The meaning of such terms is a matter

[1] This strange phenomenon has actually occurred in the Back of the Yards area of Chicago.

of each man's private definition. They cannot be tested operationally. They are therefore more suitable for sermons than for science.

I do not object to sermons as such, but I believe that they are out of place in the political science class-room. They confuse the students and inhibit the learning process. Furthermore, they have little effect in influencing the course of human affairs. Political scientists have been preaching for generations, and yet, with few exceptions, their impact upon political life has been negligible. Many realize this failing, yet they continue to preach as if driven to it by a neurotic compulsion. They seem to feel that, so long as they announce to the world the nature of correct behavior, they have no further obligation. I believe that that is a narrow and degrading conception of the political scientist's obligations to his fellow-men.

I believe that the social sciences can and should be useful to our society,[2] I believe that the social scientist can be most useful if he confines his scholarly efforts entirely to observing and analyzing the functioning of the organizations of our society and to explaining these organizations to his students and to others who may read his writings or hear his lectures. I also believe that, as a citizen, he has the same rights and obligations as other citizens, but that he should make special effort to keep his personal value judgments and advocacy of policy from intruding into his scientific research. In that way he will make his contribution to our democracy. If others interpret his failure to preach as meaning that he is unconcerned over the struggle between democracy and fascism, he need not have a guilty conscience, for he can see the results of his work put into action, whereas the academic moralist can enjoy only the pleasures of self-expression.

IV. POLITICS AND ETHICS: A REJOINDER TO WILLIAM F. WHYTE

JOHN H. HALLOWELL
Duke University

In his original article, Professor Whyte not only declared that "political scientists should take an interest in politics," but insisted that "they should leave ethics to the philosophers and concern themselves primarily with the description and analysis of political behavior." The first statement, if not presumptuous and gratuitous advice, is certainly innocuous, and I did, and do, not question what is obviously a truism. It is with the second statement that I did, and do, take issue.

[2] For a detailed discussion of this point, see my article, "Can the Social Sciences be Useful?," in the Spring, 1944, issue of *The American Scholar*.

One may choose not to discuss "the philosophy of science," but if he is to contend that the methods of natural science are alone appropriate and adequate for the study of political phenomena, he has no choice but to defend the philosophical position implicit in his choice of research techniques. It is my contention that the description and analysis of political behavior necessarily involves metaphysical speculation and ethical evaluation.[1] Frequently this speculation and evaluation is implicit or subconscious. To make it explicit where it is implicit, to analyze its implications, consistency, and validity, has been the task of political science since Plato and Aristotle first sought rationally to understand the nature of man and of politics. A political science that long persisted in an obscurantist endeavor to suppress an analysis of its implicit or subconscious presuppositions would ultimately destroy itself by destroying any vital meaning it might have for the human beings whose political behavior and institutions it seeks to understand.

Now I confess that I do not understand what it means "to analyze political behavior in terms of the social structure of our society" if it does not mean to analyze political behavior in terms of what is good and bad for the human beings who compose our society. Professor Whyte is perturbed by the fact that I have not stated clearly enough for him whether I regard "the methods of field research" he proposes as "good or bad." He sees clearly the necessity of distinguishing between good and bad methods of research and clearly thinks that his methods are good. But if the categories of good and bad are essential to the choice of research techniques, are they not of equal validity in evaluating the fruits of research? Research, however dispassionate and detached in its methods, achieves meaning and can lay claim to truth only by transcending itself, only by relating itself to something of significance beyond its immediate concern. The natural sciences, for example, achieve meaning and lay claim to truth only by presupposing the existence of a kind of universe the existence of which they can never prove by the use of their own techniques.[2] Political science achieves meaning only by presupposing that the fruits of its research are of value to human beings who have a capacity to reason, to choose alternative modes of behavior, to differentiate good from bad, who have a destiny that transcends the demands of time and place. If we deny

[1] Detailed arguments in support of this position were presented in my original article on "Politics and Ethics," in this REVIEW, Aug., 1944, pp. 639–655.

[2] See A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (1925), especially Chap. I. In part, Whitehead says (p. 27): "Faith in reason is the trust that the ultimate nature of things lies together in a harmony which excludes mere arbitrariness. It is the faith that at the base of things we shall not find mere arbitrary mystery. The faith in the order of nature which has made possible the growth of science is a particular example of a deeper faith. This faith cannot be justified by any inductive generalization."

these attributes of humanity, we deny at the same time any possibility of understanding its political behavior rationally, *i.e.* the possibility of political science. It would, indeed, simplify the task of political science if man were an automaton controlled by forces completely outside his own control—except that there would then be no political scientists to understand the mechanism. Science can explain a great deal, but it cannot explain the scientist nor his passion for truth.

"I look upon the values of the people I study [discovered through interviewing and observation]," Whyte declares, "as important research data. I feel that my own values have no place in my analysis of human behavior, and I try to disregard them as much as I can." (This statement, it should be noted, summarizes the position that is commonly recognized as positivistic.) Now human value judgments, I contend, are something more important and vital than "research data" (whatever that may mean). They are the forces that can create a better world in which to live or provide the dynamite to blow it apart. An engineer may calculate in a detached fashion the amount of dynamite necessary to destroy a dam, explaining where the charges may best be placed for the most effective result, but a political scientist who was indifferent to the fate of the human race would have to be less than human.

Whyte cautions us against intruding our own value judgments because "the ethical values of the researcher" do not meet the scientific requirement of "first-hand observation and/or experimentation." Now the "researcher," I assume, is not a delicately contrived recording machine, a horse, or a poached egg, but a human being.[3] As a human being with the capacity to reason (he must be able to reason if he can aspire to understand political phenomena rationally), the "researcher" might conceivably use his reason to discover those things which are good and bad for him as a human being. He has ample opportunity for first-hand observation, if he is only slightly introspective, and he may acquire through reading the rational observations of others who have sought to understand what is good for man—a portion of what is commonly called wisdom. Having reached some conclusions through reason and experience as to what is good for him as a human being, the "researcher" might then, if he is daring, further assume that he is not essentially unlike other human beings (an assumption he may verify by observation and communication) and conclude that what he has discovered through reason to be good for him as a human being is probably good for all human beings.

[3] Man lives, thinks, and acts in society. It violates common sense and is unrealistic to separate any one of these functions from the others. Only an intellectual contortionist could conceive of a man who thinks but does not live or act in society. An individual is not a part-time scientist, a part-time citizen, and a part-time man, but all of these things at one and the same time—in short, always a human being.

Now, of course, human nature being what it is, refractory and fallible, there is the possibility, if not probability, that his judgments will be warped by self-interest and limited by the fallibility to which all of us are prone. It is for that reason that we require the correction of our judgments that comes from submitting them to the judgment of other rational beings. But the fact that our judgments may be perverted by pride and only partially true is no argument for not seeking the eternal good and the ultimate truth that eludes us all. The recognition of the partiality and perversion of our own portion of the truth is itself an acknowledgment of a more ultimate truth in terms of which we recognize our own truth as partial.

The only rational reason for seeking to understand political institutions and behavior is the possible human benefit that may be derived from such a study. If our interest in studying politics is unrelated to human welfare and to such concepts as justice and freedom, there is, of course, no reason why we should seek to describe political behavior in ethical terms. But if our interest in politics is motivated by an interest in human welfare, it becomes not only our right, but our responsibility, to detect corruption, to identify injustice and tyranny, to unmask sophistry, and to guide men along the paths most likely to yield happiness and freedom.

If we have no confidence in our own judgment, as that judgment has been nourished by reason, experience, and training, then we have no business in the political arena any more than the physician who doubts his ability to cure his patients or to alleviate their suffering should practice medicine. We do not accuse the physician who exhorts his patient to follow a regimen that will alleviate his physical suffering of imposing his own judgment upon others or of being unscientific. Why should the political scientist who, in the tradition of political science since the days of Aristotle, dispenses moral and political prescriptions and judgments be any more suspect? Is the moral and political health of the community less desirable than the physical health of the individual? Both the physician and the political scientist are willing to defend their judgments by reason, and both limit their advice to persuasion. What more can be demanded?

Whatever else political science may include, it starts with man. Man lives, not for the sake of existence alone, but that he may live well. It is characteristic of his nature that he is constantly seeking a justification for his existence and for his behavior. Man feels himself to be under the judgment of something beyond himself, a part of a reality that transcends his physical nature. For man is conscious not only of what he is, but of what he ought to be and may become. In ethics, he seeks rationally to define and understand not only what he is but what he ought to be. In politics, he seeks, however frustrated he may be by some politicians who

think of politics as a game to be played for itself and the personal reward it yields, the implementation of that good in social life. To assist in the implementation of that good is, as I see it, the major function of political science.

Now there is no reason at all why political scientists who have the opportunity and the talent should not be "participant observers."[4] But it is difficult to understand why such participation should be limited to political machines, why one should assume *a priori* that the political boss can teach us more than the statesman. Nor is it clear that the truth about politics can be obtained only by political participation. The politician is no more likely to be a repository of political wisdom than the accountant is likely to be an authority on mathematics, or the engineer a physicist. The fact that the physicist may never have built a bridge, or have the necessary skill to build a bridge if he wanted to, in no way invalidates the knowledge he has of the principles that must be followed if a bridge is to be built.

Dionysius of Syracuse is remembered today, not because of any political techniques he employed or political institutions he founded, but solely as the tyrant who unwisely shunned the political advice proffered him by Plato. The rise and fall of tyrants ever since has served only to accentuate the eternal wisdom of the political philosopher who understood the strength and weakness of tyranny better than did the tyrants themselves. That politicians of all nations and ages have at one time or another ignored the political principles that might make for a more happy and just society is condemnatory of themselves, not of the principles nor of the philosophers who formulated them. Mayor Hague, it is true, does not turn to political scientists for advice as to how to administer the affairs of Jersey City. Would Professor Whyte consider me impertinent if I suggested that the affairs of Jersey City might be greatly improved under the administration of a mayor who was willing to take such advice? As political scientists who are also instructors of youth, should we encourage our students to emulate the methods of Mayor Hague or, let us say, of

[4] As a matter of fact, although Professor Whyte seems unaware of it, the number of political scientists who have participated in political campaigns both as candidates and as observers is high. One political scientist became President of the United States. During the war years the number of political scientists called upon by the government for national service in positions of responsibility was particularly large, as any casual glance at the News and Notes section of this REVIEW will testify. Perhaps it is true that they have not studied political conditions in the slums as much as Professor Whyte would like them to do, but in view of the responsible positions they have held they can hardly be accused of avoiding either participation in politics or the observation of political institutions. Political scientists have not only had access to the data required for studying "high level organizations," but many of them have themselves actually contributed to such "data."

Hitler? Should we discourage them? A frank answer from Professor Whyte would soon clarify the implications of his position.

Professor Whyte says that he believes that "the social sciences can and should be useful to our society." So do all social scientists. The question is: Useful in what way and to what end? It is my contention that they can be most useful when they are deliberately, consciously, and rationally directed towards making men better human beings— when they seek to discover the principles that make for a free and just society and encourage men by the best means at their disposal to put those principles into practice. If that involves hortatory appeals to the conscience of men, then what our society needs, now more than ever, are clearer and stronger appeals. I vigorously dissent from the view that "good government" is, as Whyte maintains, "a matter of each man's private definition." If it were so, there could be no government at all.

The social sciences are not so much in need of new research techniques as of convictions based upon principles. If they have become sterile, as Professor Whyte believes, it is not because they are lacking in adequate research techniques, but because they are hesitant about affirming unequivocally the principles upon which a free and just society can be based. A social science that is not committed to the search for freedom and justice has already signed its own death warrant.

NEWS AND NOTES

PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

Compiled by the Managing Editor

Professor Pendleton Herring, of Harvard University, has succeeded Professor Francis W. Coker, of Yale University, as representative of the American Political Science Association in the Social Science Research Council. The Association's other two representatives are Professors Charles E. Merriam, of the University of Chicago, and Charles S. Hyneman, personnel recruiting specialist, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Dr. John D. Millett is on terminal leave as a colonel in the Army of the United States and has returned to Columbia University as associate professor of public administration.

Mr. Rexford G. Tugwell, governor of Puerto Rico, has been appointed professor of political science at the University of Chicago and director of the Institute of Planning. He will assume his duties on July 1.

Professor Walter H. C. Laves, administrative consultant on international affairs, U. S. Bureau of the Budget, served as adviser to the American delegation to the First United Nations Assembly in London, and since returning to Washington has been giving a course on international administration at the School of Advanced International Studies.

On March 18–22, Professor Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University, delivered five lectures on "Total War and the Constitution" on the William W. Cook Foundation at the University of Michigan.

Professor Charles M. Kneier has returned to his post at the University of Illinois. He has been awarded the Legion of Merit by the War Department for his work as head of the public administration section of the School of Military Government at Charlottesville, Virginia, where he served with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

An address on "The British Commonwealth and Trusteeship" was given at the Royal Institute of International Affairs by Mr. H. Duncan Hall during a visit to London in connection with his work as director of the British official war history on the civilian side in North America. The address is being published in *International Affairs*.

Professor Harlow J. Heneman has resigned his position at the University of Michigan in order to accept an appointment with the Bureau of the Budget in Washington.

Professor Charles E. Martin, of the University of Washington, was director of the twenty-first session of the Institute of World Affairs at Riverside, California, December 16–19, 1945. Mr. Kline R. Swygard, of the University of Washington, also participated.

Miss Sarah G. Blanding, recently elected president of Vassar College, was, until she became director of the College of Home Economics at Cornell University in 1941, assistant, and later associate, professor of political science at the University of Kentucky.

After two years of service in the U. S. Signal Corps during the war, Dr. Frank H. Jonas, formerly assistant professor of government and citizenship at the University of New Mexico, has accepted an assistant professorship of political science at the Utah State Agricultural College.

Dr. Jack T. Johnson, who has been on military leave, has returned to his duties as assistant professor at the University of Iowa. During the past two years, he served as a Russian interpreter and translator for the U. S. Navy. One of his tours of duty was with a portion of the Red Fleet.

Professor Karl Loewenstein, on leave from Amherst College, is in Germany with the Legal Division of the U. S. Group of Control Council. A new book by him, entitled *Political Reconstruction*, has lately been published by the Macmillan Company.

Professor John W. Masland, Jr., of Stanford University, has joined the Commission on Political Matters at Tokyo, serving under General MacArthur as an advisory board. The commission, together with one on economics and one on natural resources, is expected to serve for a period of approximately nine months.

Major Charles K. Horwitz, now on military leave from the Department of Welfare in New York City, where he has served as regional director and administrator since 1934, was recently awarded a "certificate of commendation" by the Commanding General of the Second Service Command for his contribution to the war mission in helping to organize and administer Army Emergency Relief and Personal Affairs activities. Major Horwitz has been serving as executive officer of these activities in the Second Service Command, with headquarters at Governor's Island, New York.

Professor Benjamin F. Wright has resigned the chairmanship of the department of government at Harvard University in order to accept the chairmanship of the Standing Committee on General Education which has been created to put the Harvard Report, *General Education in a Free Society*, into effect. His successor as chairman of the department of gov-

ernment is Professor Merle Fainsod, formerly director for the Retail Trades and Services Division, OPA, and deputy director of the Civil Affairs Training Program at Harvard.

Colonel Charles Fairman returned to Stanford University for the spring quarter after serving in the Judge Advocate General's Division of the Army since May, 1942. Sent to Africa early in 1943 to be chief counsel of the Allied Military Government of occupied territory, he later moved into Italy and thence to Paris and Frankfurt. Here he was chief of the International Law Division of the office of the Theater Judge Advocate. In more recent months, he was associated with Mr. Justice Jackson in the compilation indictment of war criminals. Colonel Fairman has been granted the Legion of Merit for his services.

After more than three years of government service in Washington and abroad, Dr. Gabriel A. Almond has returned to his teaching position at Brooklyn College, and has been granted a "demobilization award" by the Social Science Research Council to continue studies of German political development which he began as head of the Foreign Information Section, Domestic Branch, OWI, and as Deputy Chief, Documentary Research and Analysis, Morale Division, United States Strategic Bombing Survey.

After three years of service in the Army and six months' service as instructor in the Army University Center in Florence, Dr. Hugh E. Kelso, formerly of the department of history and government of Dennison University, has accepted an assistant professorship of government in the School of Business Administration at the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Florida.

Dr. Donald C. Stone, of the U. S. Bureau of the Budget, served as a member of the American delegation in the conference on UNESCO in London, as United States representative on the Administrative and Budgetary Committee of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, as advisor to the United States delegation at the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and as United States representative on the Preparatory Commission of UNESCO.

Dr. Joseph R. Starr, associate professor at the University of Minnesota, has resigned his position on the staff of the University. He received an honorable discharge from the U. S. Army at Marburg, Germany, on October 27, 1945, after serving for over two years in North Africa, France, and Germany, and has accepted a position as an historical officer with the Historical Division, Headquarters U. S. Forces, European Theater, with headquarters at Hochst near Frankfurt.

Dr. Paul K. Walp, formerly of the University of Tennessee and later secretary of the board of civil service examiners, U. S. Engineers Office, War Department, Manhattan District, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, has been appointed placement adviser for the maintenance division of the Civilian Personnel Office in the San Bernardino Air Technical Service Command. He is the holder of a War Department award for "work essential to the production of the atomic bomb."

Dr. Joseph M. Ray, formerly of the University of Alabama, has been made head of the department of government and politics at the University of Maryland.

During January, Professor Walter R. Sharp, of the College of the City of New York, served as associate secretary of the United Nations Site Committee, assisting in the investigations leading to the eventual selection of a location for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organization.

During the first term of the 1946 summer session, the University of Wyoming is holding an Institute of Pacific and Far-Eastern Affairs. The Institute will be devoted to the politics and problems of the Far East, with emphasis on an American policy in that region. Dr. Feliks Gross, lecturer at New York University, is director.

After teaching at Columbia University four years and serving as assistant to the dean of Columbia College, Dr. Richard C. Snyder has accepted an assistant professorship at Princeton University.

Dr. Karl A. Bosworth has been appointed assistant professor of political science at Western Reserve University. After receiving his doctor's degree at the University of Chicago, Dr. Bosworth was connected with the Institute of Public Administration at the University of Alabama, the Illinois Legislative Reference Council, and most recently the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada.

Mr. Lorrace Catterson, formerly of the University of Missouri and later of the Arkansas Polytechnical College, and recently returned from air service in Italy, has accepted an instructorship at Florida State College for Women.

Following his return from India, where he served as special representative of the Foreign Economic Administration and special agent of the U. S. Commercial Company, Dr. Eric Beecroft, formerly of the University of California, has been appointed special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior.

The Canadian Institute of International Affairs has started publication

of a new quarterly, *International Journal*, edited by C. Cecil Lingard and devoted exclusively to international relations. Subscriptions, at three dollars a year, may be sent to the Institute, 230 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Canada.

Dr. Lee S. Greene, of the University of Tennessee, has been elected chairman of the Knoxville civil service board.

After three years with the Department of Justice and the Office of Strategic Services, Dr. Alexander N. Dragnich has accepted an assistant professorship at Western Reserve University.

Mr. Francis W. Russell, chief of the Division of Public Liaison in the Department of State, invites correspondence from teachers of political science regarding the work of this unit.

Dr. Marian D. Irish, of Florida State College for Women, has been appointed consultant to the recently organized Florida tax commission.

After three years of service as lieutenant commander in the Navy, most of the time in combat intelligence work at Pearl Harbor, Dr. Hollis W. Barber has returned to Tulane University, where he has been promoted to the rank of associate professor.

Professors David Fellman, of the University of Nebraska, William M. Gibson, of Duke University, and Spencer D. Albright, who has taught at Reed College and the University of Washington, will give courses at the University of Wisconsin during the coming summer session.

With the return of Associate Professor E. F. Spellacy from the Navy, the University of Washington has completed its postwar staff in political science.

Seattle and the University of Washington will be hosts at the May meeting of the Maritime Division of the I. L. O. The University bureau of international relations has been designated liaison agency for student relations with the meeting.

At the University of Tennessee, Mr. Fred J. Khouri and Mr. Robert G. Crawford have been named instructors in political science.

Mr. Clinton L. Rossiter, recently released from naval service, has been appointed instructor at the University of Michigan.

Dr. Arthur D. Angel, instructor in political science at Pomona Junior College, was, in January, appointed assistant professor of social science at Drake University.

Dr. Harold W. Davey, formerly of the Illinois Institute of Technology,

has become director of the Institute on Postwar Reconstruction at New York University.

Dr. Andrew Gyorgy, author of a recent work on geopolitics, has been appointed to an assistant professorship at the University of New Hampshire.

Professor Charles F. Spencer has recently returned from service in the Navy to his teaching position in East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma.

After three years of service as captain, major, and lieutenant colonel in the Army, Professor James Q. Dealey, Jr., has returned to Hamilton College. During most of his service he was with the G-5 section of the 1st U. S. Army staff, and during the German phase of the invasion he had charge of the civil administration sub-section of that section. After the surrender, he left Germany and went to Paris in connection with the planning of the organization of the two army universities in France and Great Britain.

Dr. George H. Watson, recently discharged from Civilian Public Service, has been appointed associate professor and acting chairman of the political science department at Roosevelt College, Chicago. Before entering Civilian Public Service a year ago, he served for two years as executive director of the Federation of Tax Administrators.

Dr. Hans Aufricht, formerly of New York University and Hunter College, has been appointed assistant on international organization affairs in the Division of International Organization Affairs of the Department of State.

Major Valentine Jobst III, who was in the Army Air Force from April, 1942, and stationed chiefly at Selfridge Field, Michigan, and Orlando, Florida, has returned to academic work at the University of Illinois.

After two years of service in the Civil Affairs Division in England, France, Germany, and Austria, Lieutenant Colonel Leon H. Durst has been appointed chief of the Field Service Public Relations Division in Branch Office 9 of the Veterans Administration, covering the states of Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and part of Texas.

After service in England with the Office of War Information and later with the Office of Strategic Services, Dr. Irwin M. Tobin, assistant professor at Rhode Island State College, has been appointed a specialist on the British Commonwealth of Nations in the new Division of International Labor, Health, and Social Affairs in the U. S. Department of State.

Professor Charles H. McLaughlin, of the University of Minnesota, has received a demobilization award from the Social Science Research Council. He is located at Columbia University for the completion of his work for the doctorate, and expects to return to Minnesota for the fall quarter, 1946.

Professors Harold S. Quigley and A. N. Christensen, of the University of Minnesota, will teach during the coming summer at the University of Wyoming and the Colorado State College of Education at Greeley, respectively.

Professor Jasper B. Shannon has returned to his position at the University of Kentucky after an absence of three and a half years, during which time he served successively as visiting professor at the University of Wisconsin, head of the division of legislative analysis in the Department of Agriculture in Washington, acting director of the Graduate School in the Department of Agriculture, and instructor in the U. S. Army Training Center at Florence, Italy.

The professional graduate course in public administration in the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, has been made a twelve-month program. A course program starts July 1, 1946, and another January 1, 1947, to accommodate the veteran demand.

The Macmillan Company announces that it has entered into an arrangement with ex-Secretary Cordell Hull for the publication of his memoirs. Colonel Andrew H. Berding is assisting Mr. Hull in the preparation of the book, which should be ready for the press sometime in 1947.

At the University of Pennsylvania, Professor James C. Charlesworth has returned from Army duty, and Major John R. Probert and Lieut. Commander Charles H. Harry, recently released from the services, have been appointed instructors.

At the University of Texas, Professor Emmette S. Redford returned in November after four years of service with the OPA, during the last year as assistant deputy administrator for rationing in the Washington office; and the following returned in March: Professor O. Douglas Weeks, who served as chairman of the political science branch of the Shrivenham American University and later in the political science branch at Biarritz; Professor Delevan Evans, who had been teaching history and government at the U. S. Military Academy; and Professor Edward G. Lewis, who had served with Naval Military Government.

Dr. Raymond L. Buell, foreign affairs adviser to *Time* and *Life*, died in Montreal on February 20, at the age of forty-nine. In earlier years,

Dr. Buell taught in a number of universities, and among posts later held were those of research director and subsequently president of the Foreign Policy Association, director of the Geneva Research Center, and chairman of the Public Affairs Committee. His books included: *Contemporary French Politics* (1920); *The Washington Conference* (1922); *International Relations* (1925); *Democratic Governments in Europe* (1935); and *Poland: Key to Europe* (1939). In 1940, he was a research worker in the Willkie campaign, and two years later he unsuccessfully sought a Republican nomination for Congress in the Massachusetts district in which he made his home.

At Indiana University, Professor Ford P. Hall, head of the department of government, has been named dean of a newly established Division of Adult Education and State Services. Professor Hall will assume the new position July 1, and will continue to act as head of the department of government for an indefinite period. Professor Pressly S. Sikes has recently been appointed dean of the Junior Division of the University and will give full time to his new duties, although for the time being retaining the directorship of the Institute of Government Research.

At the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies held at Rye, New York, on January 24–25, officers of the Council for 1946 were elected as follows: chairman, Fred N. Robinson, American Academy of Arts and Sciences; vice-chairman, Frederic A. Ogg, American Political Science Association; secretary-treasurer, S. Whittemore Boggs, Association of American Geographers; members of the executive committee, A. R. Bellinger, American Numismatic Society, John M. Cooper, American Anthropological Association, Sturgis E. Leavitt, Modern Language Association of America, and Glenn R. Morrow, American Philosophical Association. Professors Joseph P. Chamberlain, of Columbia University, and Frederic A. Ogg, of the University of Wisconsin, delegates of the American Political Science Association, attended the meeting, and Professor Kenneth Colegrove, of Northwestern University, attended the conference of secretaries regularly held in conjunction with it. The ACLS now embraces twenty-four major learned societies in the fields of the humanities and social sciences and has an annual budget for aid to research and publication, for special projects, and for administrative expenses, amounting to approximately $300,000.

Following a year's study by a special committee, the University of Michigan has established an Institute of Public Administration, designed to provide instruction and counseling for graduate and undergraduate students in public administration, conduct research, offer services to public administrative offices and legislative bodies, and provide in-service

training for advanced students through coöperation with offices of various units of government. The Institute will be under the direction of an executive committee with Dean E. Blythe Stason, of the Law School, as acting chairman and Professor John A. Perkins, of the political science department, as secretary.

At Fordham University, an organization known as the Burke Society has been formed to promote the study of political society. Dr. Ross J. S. Hoffman is chairman, and the charter membership consists of the members of the two departments of history and political philosophy and the social sciences. Four discussion meetings are being held during the current academic year on the general subject of democracy: the Soviet use of the term, promotion through American foreign policy, the rôle of public opinion in a democracy, and the possibility of "socialist" democracy remaining democratic. All of the discussions are to be published, and papers delivered at an initial meeting, comprising a symposium on De Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, have already been issued as "Fordham University Studies, Burke Society Series, No. 1."

Forty-first Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. The forty-first annual meeting of the American Political Science Association was held at Philadelphia March 28–30, 1946, with the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel as headquarters. This was the first normal annual meeting of the Association since the American entrance into World War II. Although held in 1946, it was considered the 1945 annual meeting. Due to congested hotel accommodations, the Association did not hold a joint meeting with allied societies, although the Southern Political Science Association was invited to have its presidential address delivered on the same evening as that of the American Political Science Association. On this occasion, President John M. Gaus delivered an address on "Job Analysis of Political Science," and President H. C. Nixon, of the Southern Political Science Association, spoke on the subject of "Politics of the Hills." Several of the round tables were offered in coöperation with the American Society for Public Administration, which had met in the same place on the preceding two days. A round table on "Education for World Citizenship" was held in collaboration with the National Council for the Social Studies. There were also breakfast meetings of the Council of the Southern Political Science Association and the Managerial Committee of the Mid-West Conference of Political Scientists.

The termination of the war and the removal of the Office of Defense Transportation's restrictions on conventions occurred so late in 1945 that it was not considered practicable to plan a meeting for the Christmas recess in that year. A poll of the Executive Council of the Association

indicated a desire for a meeting in the spring. President John M. Gaus assumed responsibility for the preparation of the program, assisted by Pitman B. Potter and Ernest S. Griffith.

In past years, the program generally included two somewhat different types of meetings. The first consisted chiefly of informal participation without prepared papers and the second consisted of the latter alone. Because of unusual circumstances this year, the Program Committee left wide discretion to the chairmen who organized the various meetings, and no effort was made to differentiate sharply between sessions of the two types. Another unusual feature of the program of the 1945 meeting was the devotion of a full day to Association problems. As will be noted from the program below, the session that day opened with a series of panel meetings conducted by the panel chairmen of the Association's Committee on Research. These panels included comparative government, international relations, public law, public opinion, political theory, representative government and the legislative process, military and naval strategy in relation to political science, public administration, and state, local, and municipal government. The luncheon meeting supplied an occasion for considering relationships between the Association and the Social Science Research Council. The afternoon sessions began with reports from three important committees of the Association—the Research Committee, the Committee on Social Studies, and the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction. Late afternoon of the same day was devoted to the business meeting of the Association.

The program of the meeting as actually carried out was as follows:

Thursday, March 28, at 9:30 A.M.

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT—EUROPE

Chairman: David Fellman, University of Nebraska
Participants:

Eugene P. Chase, Department of State and Lafayette College—"The Labor Government of Great Britain."

Charles A. Micaud, United States Military Academy—"The Launching of the Fourth French Republic."

Max Ascoli, New School for Social Research—"The Political Reconstruction of Italy."

Eric C. Bellquist, Department of State and the University of California—"Government and Politics in the Smaller Countries of Northern Europe: An Appraisal of Recent Developments."

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT—THE FAR EAST

POLITICAL REORGANIZATION IN CHINA

Chairman: Harold Quigley, University of Minnesota
Participants:

Paul M. A. Linebarger, Duke University—"The Program of the Kuomintang."

Harold M. Vinacke, University of Cincinnati—"The Communist-Agrarian Program."
David N. Rowe, Yale University—"Non-Party Programs."
Amry Vandenbosch, University of Kentucky—"The Policy of the United States."

ADAPTATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND OTHER NATIONAL AGENCIES TO INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

Chairman: Clyde Eagleton, New York University
Participants: Herbert Abraham, Office of International Information and Walter H. C. Laves, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, "Recent Reorganizations of the Department of State"; Harry N. Kurth, Director, Office of Budget and Finance, Department of State; Donald C. Stone, Bureau of the Budget; S. M. Rosen, Bureau of the Budget; Egon Ranshofen-Wertheimer, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

LATIN AMERICA

Democracy in Latin America

Chairman: Russell Fitzgibbon, University of California at Los Angeles
Participants: Ellis O. Briggs, U. S. Department of State; A. N. Christensen, University of Minnesota; William Cochran, U. S. Department of State; Lewis Hanke, Library of Congress; Major Willmore Kendall, U. S. Army; William Ebenstein, University of Wisconsin; Edgar Cale, University of Pennsylvania; William S. Stokes, Northwestern University; Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania; and others.

POLITICAL THEORY

Chairman: William M. McGovern, Northwestern University
Participants: William Y. Elliott, Harvard University; Waldemar Gurian, Notre Dame University; Lindsay Rogers, Columbia University; Eric Voegelin, Louisiana State University.

STATE GOVERNMENT

Recent Constitutional Revision

Chairman: William L. Bradshaw, University of Missouri
Participants:
Isidor Loeb, Washington University—"The Recent Missouri Convention."
Martin L. Faust, University of Missouri—"Revision and Administrative Reorganization."
Albert B. Saye, University of Georgia—"The Georgia Commission."
John J. George, Rutgers University—"Why Revision Failed in New Jersey."
Discussion: Thomas S. Barclay, Stanford University; John E. Bebout, National Municipal League; William Miller, Princeton Survey; Kirk H. Porter, State University of Iowa.

UNIVERSITY BUREAUS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Chairman: Roscoe Martin, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama
Participants:
James W. Fesler, Civilian Production Administration, "Public Administration as a Special Field."

Rowland Egger, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Virginia—"Public Administration and Related Fields."

Lent D. Upson, School of Public Affairs, Wayne University, "The School of Public Administration as an Answer to Special Needs."

Samuel C. May, Bureau of Public Administration, University of California—"The Bureau of Public Administration as an Answer to Special Needs."

Thursday, March 28, at 12:15 P.M.

LUNCHEON MEETING

THE UNITED NATIONS

Chairman: Pitman Potter, American University

Speakers:

William E. Rappard, Director, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland—"The United Nations as Viewed from Geneva."

Francis O. Wilcox, Head Analyst on International Affairs, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress—"The General Assembly of the United Nations."

Clarence Streit, President, Federal Union, Inc.,—"The Federal Union Point of View."

Thursday, March 28, at 2:00 P.M.

EDUCATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

(JOINT PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES AND THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION)

Chairman: Hilda Watters, Western Illinois State Teachers College

Secretary: Julian Aldrich, New York University

Participants:

Kirk H. Porter, University of Iowa, and Herbert Abraham, United States Department of State—"What Should Elementary and High School Teachers Try to Teach about International Government?"

W. F. Cottrell, Miami University—"What Should Be Taught About Other Governmental Systems?"

Harold M. Long, Glens Falls, N. Y., High School—"How Can International Organization Be Taught to Elementary and High School Pupils?"

FEDERALISM AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Chairman: William Anderson, University of Minnesota

Participants:

Arnold Brecht, Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research—"European Experience."

Herman Finer, Harvard University—"Comparative Federalism."

Arthur Macmahon, Columbia University—"American Experience."

H. M. Clokie, University of Manitoba—"Canadian Experience."

Llewelyn E. Pfankuchen, University of Wisconsin—"Federalism in International Organization."

Discussion: Quincy Wright, University of Chicago; Reginald D. Lang, Carleton College; Werner Levi, University of Minnesota; Ben A. Arneson, Ohio Wesleyan University; Raphael Tuck, McGill University; Everett Claspy, U. S.

Department of State; Morley Ayearst, New York University; H. Gordon Skilling, University of Wisconsin.

GOVERNMENT AND CONSUMERS

Chairman: Egbert Wengert, Sweet Briar College
Participants:
Chase G. Woodhouse, Member of the House of Representatives—"Progress in Consumer Protection."
W. S. Sayre and James Scully, Office of Price Administration—"The Consumer and the O.P.A. and the Public Interest."
Florence Stewart, National Housing Agency—"The Consumer and the N.H.A."
Robert Walker, Kansas State College—"The United States Department of Agriculture's Consumer Counsel."
Ralph Baker, New York State College for Teachers—"The Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel."

GOVERNMENT AND LABOR

Chairman: Glenn Wiltsey, University of Rochester
Participants:
Paul M. Herzog, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board—"Government Responsibility for the Prevention of Unfair Labor Practices."
Edgar L. Warren, Chief of the United States Conciliation Service—"The Effectiveness of Non-Coercive Forms of Administrative Action in Adjusting Labor Disputes."
Walter Gellhorn, Columbia University—"The Use of Tri-Partite Panels in Labor Disputes."

IMPLICATIONS OF WAR TRAINING IN OVERSEAS ADMINISTRATION FOR PEACETIME EDUCATION

Chairman: Arnold Wolfers, Yale University
Participants:
Colonel Herman Beukema, United States Military Academy—"Some Implications of the ASTP."
Joseph P. Harris, University of California—"Some Implications of the Training Program at the School of Military Government."
Rollin B. Posey, Northwestern University—"Some Implications of the Training Program in the CATS at Northwestern University."
Lawrence Chamberlain, Columbia University—"Some Implications of the Training Program of the Naval School of Military Government and Administration."
Discussion: Major Robert Fisher, School of Military Government, Charlottesville, Virginia.

THE METROPOLITAN REGION

Chairman: Albert Lepawsky, University of Alabama
Secretary: Joseph M. Ray, University of Maryland
Participants:
Edwin A. Cottrell, Stanford University—"Government of Metropolitan Regions in California."
Don Leiffer, Boston University—"Developments in Metropolitan Government in New England."

W. Hardy Wickwar, UNRRA—"Regional Developments in Post-War Britain."
Robert B. Mitchell, Executive Director, Philadelphia Planning Commission—"The Process of Planning in Metropolitan Regions."
Weldon Cooper, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama—"Emerging Trends in the Forms of Metropolitan Government."

THE PRESIDENCY

Chairman: Louis Brownlow, Public Administration Clearing House
Participants:
James Hart, University of Virginia—"Legislative-Executive Relations: A Crucial Problem of Government."
Don K. Price, Public Administration Clearing House—"The Direct Responsibility of the President."
William Y. Elliott—"The Need for a Presidential General Staff."

THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE DURING THE WAR AND AFTER

Chairman: Walton C. Ferris, Department of State
Participants:
Elton Atwater, Research Fellow, The American University—"Recent Developments in the Foreign Service."
James McCamy, Director, Office of World Trade Policy, Department of Commerce.
Carl Strom, Assistant Chief, Division of Foreign Service Planning, Department of State—"The Proposed 'Foreign Service Act of 1946'."

SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THEIR RELATIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Chairman: Isaac N. P. Stokes, Associate Chief, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State
Participants:
Walter R. Sharp, College of the City of New York, and Consultant to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.
John Gambs, International Labor Relations Adviser, Department of Labor.
Water Radius, Advisor to the Office of Transportation and Communications, Department of State.
Leroy Stinebower, Deputy Director, Office of International Trade Policy.
Esther Brunauer, United States Representative, Preparatory Commission, UNESCO.

Thursday, March 28, at 8:00 P.M.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

Chairman: Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard University
H. C. Nixon, Vanderbilt University, President, Southern Political Science Association—"Politics of the Hills."
John M. Gaus, University of Wisconsin, President, American Political Science Association—"Job Analysis of Political Science."

Friday, March 29, at 8:00 A.M.

Breakfast Meetings

COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Chairman: Francis O. Wilcox, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress

COUNCIL OF THE SOUTHERN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Chairman: H. C. Nixon, Vanderbilt University

LATIN AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Chairman: Russell H. Fitzgibbon, University of California at Los Angeles—"The Problems of Research in Political Science in the Latin American Area."

MANAGERIAL COMMITTEE, MIDWEST CONFERENCE OF POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

Chairman: Howard White, Miami University

Friday, March 29, at 9:30 A.M.

OPEN PANEL MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, CONDUCTED BY THE PANEL CHAIRMEN

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Chairman: Harold W. Stoke, University of New Hampshire
Secretary: Andrew Gyorgy, University of New Hampshire
"New Conceptions Affecting Research in Comparative Government"
Arnold Brecht, New School for Social Research
"Significant Fields for Future Research in Comparative Government."
Taylor Cole, Duke University
"Barriers to Improvement in Research in Comparative Government"
John G. Heinberg, University of Missouri
"Utilizing the Results of Research in Comparative Government"
Eugene P. Chase, State Department

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chairman: Grayson L. Kirk, Columbia University
Discussion Leaders: Frederick S. Dunn, Yale University; Harold H. Sprout, Princeton University; Leland Goodrich, World Peace Foundation and Brown University.

PUBLIC LAW

Chairman: Carl B. Swisher, Johns Hopkins University
Discussion Leaders: Kenneth C. Cole, University of Washington; Earl Latham, University of Minnesota.

PUBLIC OPINION

Chairman: Harwood L. Childs, Princeton University

Discussion Leaders: Herman C. Beyle, Syracuse University; Ruth A. Inglis, Commission on Freedom of the Press; James L. McCamy, U. S. Department of Commerce; Jesse MacKnight, U. S. Department of State.

POLITICAL THEORY

Chairman: Francis G. Wilson, University of Illinois
Discussion Leaders: John D. Lewis, Oberlin College; Wilfrid Parsons, Catholic University; Paul A. Palmer, Kenyon College.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT AND THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Chairman: Roland Young, Washington, D. C.
Secretary: Stephen K. Bailey, Washington, D. C.
Discussion Leaders: Belle Zeller, Brooklyn College; Hugh MacDowall Clokie, University of Manitoba; Avery Leiserson, University of Chicago; Ernest S. Griffith, Library of Congress.

MILITARY AND NAVAL STRATEGY IN RELATION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

Chairman: Bernard Brodie, Yale University
Discussion Leaders: Edward Mead Earle, Institute of Advanced Studies; Sigmund Newmann, Wesleyan University; Col. Walter H. E. Jaeger, Army Industrial College; Quincy Wright, University of Chicago.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Chairman: Patterson H. French, Bureau of the Budget
Discussion Leaders: Herman Finer, Harvard University; James W. Fesler, Civilian Production Administration; Donald H. Morrison, Dartmouth College.

STATE, LOCAL, AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

Chairman: William Anderson, University of Minnesota
Secretary: Kimbrough Owen, U. S. Army
Discussion Leaders: Charles W. Hyneman, Federal Communications Commission; George W. Spicer, University of Virginia; John E. Stoner, University of Indiana; Paul Ylvisaker, Harvard University.
Participants: Karl Bosworth, Western Reserve University; Arthur Bromage, University of Michigan; John P. Duncan, Oklahoma A & M College; Ernest S. Griffith, Library of Congress; Orren C. Hormell, Bowdoin College; Fritz Morstein Marx, U. S. Bureau of the Budget; Lloyd M. Short, University of Minnesota.

Friday, March 29, 12:15 P.M.

LUNCHEON MEETING

THE ASSOCIATION AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Chairman: First Vice-President Robert T. Crane
Speakers: Francis W. Coker, Yale University; Charles S. Hyneman, Federal Communications Commission.

Friday, March 29, 2:00 P.M.

MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS ON POLICY

THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Chairman: Ernest S. Griffith, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress

THE COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Chairman: Howard White, Miami University

THE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Chairman: Francis O. Wilcox, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress

---

Friday, March 29, 4:00 P.M.

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

Friday, March 29, 6:00 P.M.

DINNER CONFERENCE

PENNSYLVANIA POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ASSOCIATION

Friday, March 29, 6:30 P.M.

DINNER CONFERENCE

RESEARCH IN MILITARY GOVERNMENT

Chairman: Carl Friedrich, Harvard University

Friday, March 29, at 8:00 P.M.

ASSOCIATION MEETING

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

Chairman: Charles C. Rohlfing, University of Pennsylvania

Speakers:

Reuben G. Gustavson, Vice-President of the University of Chicago, "The Physical Basis for the New Challenge."

Charles E. Merriam, University of Chicago, "Physics and Politics."

Saturday, March 30, at 9:30 A.M.

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT—EUROPE

Chairman: David Fellman, University of Nebraska

Participants:

Paul R. Sweet, Bates College—"The Rebirth of the Austrian Republic."

Taylor Cole, Duke University—"The Prospects for Democratic Government in Germany."

Karl R. Bopp, Director of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia—"The Nationalization of the Banks of England and France."

J. G. Heinberg, University of Missouri—"Continuity and Change in European Governments."

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT—THE FAR EAST

Political Reorganization in Japan

Chairman: Harold S. Quigley, University of Minnesota
Participants:
Nathaniel Peffer, Columbia University—"The Policy of the United States."
Joseph W. Ballantine, Department of State—"The Position of the Imperial House."
James H. Shoemaker, Colonel, War Department—"The Position of the Military-Industrial Oligarchy."
Charles N. Spinks, Lieutenant Commander, Navy Department—"The Position of the Political Parties."

UNIVERSITY BUREAUS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Chairman: Roscoe C. Martin, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama
Participants:
Robert S. Ford, Bureau of Government, University of Michigan—"The Place of the Bureau of Public Administration in the University's Administrative Structure."
Charles S. Hyneman, Federal Communications Commission—"Activities and Operations of the Bureau of Public Administration."
Morris B. Lambie, Harvard University—"Off-campus Relations of the Bureau of Public Administration."
Lee S. Greene, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Tennessee—"Problems Confronting the Newly Established Bureau of Public Administration."

INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC INFORMATION PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Chairman: Herbert Abraham, Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, Department of State
Participants:
H. Schuyler Foster, Division of Public Liaison, Department of State—"Domestic Information."
George E. Taylor, Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, Department of State—"Overseas Information."

LATIN AMERICA

Latin America and International Organization

Chairman: Russell H. Fitzgibbon, University of California at Los Angeles
Participants:
Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania—"Latin America and the UNO."
Panel Discussion

POLITICAL THEORY

Chairman: William M. McGovern, Northwestern University
Participants: Francis W. Coker, Yale University; Harold F. Gosnell, Office of Price Administration; R. C. Hartnett, University of Detroit; Lynford Lardner, Northwestern University; Charles E. Merriam, University of Chicago; Eric Voegelin, Louisiana State University; H. Zandhoff, Mount Holyoke College.

STATE GOVERNMENT

Legislative Research

Chairman: William L. Bradshaw, University of Missouri

Participants:

Donald Axelrod, Research Director, New York State Joint Legislative Committee—"Legislative Research in New York."

Robert S. Frey, Director, Pennsylvania Legislative Reference Bureau—"Drafting, Codifying, and Compiling Statutes."

Carlton F. Chute, Research Director, Missouri Committee on Legislative Research—"Meeting a Legislative Crisis."

Jack F. Isakoff, Director of Research, Illinois Legislative Council—"Fact-finding for the Illinois Legislature."

Discussion:

Victor D. Brannon, St. Louis Governmental Research Institute
Karl A. Bosworth, Western Reserve University
Walter F. Dodd, Chicago
Horace E. Flack, Maryland Legislative Reference Service
Ernest S. Griffith, Library of Congress
Gilbert G. Lentz, Hawaiian Legislative Bureau
Arthur H. Schwartz, New York State Joint Legislative Committee
Frank Shallow, Department of Unemployment Compensation, Pennsylvania
Lloyd M. Short, University of Minnesota
Belle Zeller, Brooklyn College

MANDATES AND TRUSTEESHIPS

Chairman: Carl J. Friedrich, Harvard University

Participants: Eric Beecroft, Department of the Interior; Ralph J. Bunche, Associate Chief, Division of Dependent Area Affairs, Department of State; A. Benjamin Gerig, Chief, Division of Dependent Area Affairs, Department of State; Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard University; William E. Rappard, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland.

RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN AMERICA TODAY

Chairman: Robert K. Carr, Dartmouth College

Participants: Robert E. Cushman, Cornell University; John H. Leek, University of Oklahoma; Earl Latham, University of Minnesota; Carl B. Swisher, Johns Hopkins University.

THE TREATY-MAKING PROCESS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Pitman B. Potter, American University

Participants: Edwin Borchard, Yale University; Royden Dangerfield, University of Oklahoma; Wallace McClure, Department of State.

Saturday, March 30, at 12:15 P.M.

Luncheon and General Association Meeting

THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Chairman: W. Brooke Graves, Bryn Mawr College

Speakers: Senator Robert M. La Follette, Chairman, and Representative Mike Monroney, Vice-Chairman, of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Organization of Congress.

The Executive Council of the American Political Science Association met in morning, afternoon, and evening sessions on March 27. In attendance were: President John M. Gaus, First Vice-President Robert T. Crane, Third Vice-President Dorothy Schaffter, Managing Editor Frederic A. Ogg, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer Harvey Walker, Clyde Eagleton, Amry Vandenbosch, Harold Zink, Arthur W. Bromage, Frederick S. Dunn, Charles C. Rohlfing, Edward F. Dow, Robert J. Harris, John G. Heinberg, and Walter H. C. Laves. In addition, the meeting was attended by Past Presidents Robert E. Cushman and Leonard D. White and the chairmen of most of the Association's committees. Its agenda consisted of thirty-seven items, including: report on the acts of the President; reports of the Secretary-Treasurer on the membership and finances of the Association; report of the Audit Committee; adoption of a budget for 1946; report of the Committee on Nomination of Officers for 1946; report of the Managing Editor of the REVIEW and election of members of the Board of Editors for 1946–47; report on the Personnel Service; together with reports from fifteen special and standing committees of the Association and a number of significant items of new and unscheduled business. At the dinner interlude, Dr. Waldo G. Leland, Director of the American Council of Learned Societies, discussed the development of cultural relations in the Department of State and reported on the drafting and significance of the constitution of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), in which he had taken a leading part at the organizing session in London. Dr. Leland urged the Association to concern itself with the international aspects of its discipline and proposed the eventual calling, through UNESCO, of an international conference of political scientists. He felt that the American Political Science Association should play a leading rôle in the planning and holding of such an international meeting.

On the eve of the meeting, the Secretary-Treasurer, Kenneth Colegrove, was called to Japan to advise General Douglas MacArthur on the revision of the Japanese constitution. His reports, prepared by him before his departure, were presented to the Executive Council by the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Harvey Walker. The Secretary-Treasurer reported that the membership and subscriptions of the Association on December 15, 1945, totaled 3,466. This was the largest in the history of the Association and represented a gain of 250 during the membership year. There were 3,197 regular and associate members and subscribers, 60 sustaining members, 8 contributing members, and 41 life members. The total membership figure included 160 whose dues were unpaid as of December 15. There were 526 new members and 276 cancellations. The increase in membership was due to the increased interest in the study of government and international relations, to the continuance of the mem-

bership campaign in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer, and to professional appreciation of the *Directory of the American Political Science Association*, published in September, 1945.

The financial report of the Secretary-Treasurer showed that the income of the Association for the year ended December 17, 1945, was $24,232.14, while the expenditures were $22,185.49, making a net gain for the fiscal year of $2,046.65. The bank balance of the Association in its general fund on December 17 was $9,767.03, an increase of $1,789.29 over the previous year. There were $1,002.52 in accounts receivable, and all accounts payable were paid.

The expenditures for 1945 showed an outlay of $10,163.49 for the REVIEW. This was an increase of $1,200 over the previous year, due mainly to differences in purchases of paper. Expenditures through the office of the Secretary-Treasurer totaled $12,022, an increase of approximately $3,000 over the previous year. This increase is represented by the cost of publishing the *Directory*, which amounted to $3,099.63.

Trust Funds of the Association on December 17, 1945, totaled $9,120.20, of which $8,600 was in bonds and $520.20 in cash. The assets of the Association other than cash were negligible, being represented by office equipment which now is practically depreciated out and the inventory of back numbers of the REVIEW, carried in the accounts at $8,000. There is also a small stock of other publications on which a valuation is not placed in the report.

The books of the Association for the year 1945 were closed on December 17, and a commercial audit was made on January 7, 1946, by Alexander Grant and Company (1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Illinois), Certified Public Accountants. The Committee on Audit of the Association, composed of Walter F. Dodd and Leonard D. White, examined the accounts of the Secretary-Treasurer and verified the audit prepared by the commercial auditors. The committee found the statement of accounts as prepared by the Secretary-Treasurer to be correct. The report of the committee included the following comments:

"The financial condition of the Association during the current year has been satisfactory. An increase of 250 in membership has been advantageous. The *Directory of the American Political Science Association* has been financed without the necessity of borrowing from the trust funds and will have paid for itself upon payments by members of the Association who ordered and received the *Directory* but who have not paid for it. That the *Directory* was financed without cost was due to the fact that the editorial expense was borne by the National Foundation for Education and it is recommended that the Association express its appreciation to Mr. Samuel R. Harrell, chairman of the Foundation.

"The report of the Secretary-Treasurer shows a bank balance of $9,767.03 as of December 17, 1945, but this should not encourage additional expenditures. At that time, the expense of publishing the December edition of the REVIEW had not

been paid, and the bulk of the bank balance is composed of dues collected in advance.

"The Committee recommends that members of the Association pay their dues promptly. Much work is required and much expense incurred in sending out second, third, and fourth statements of membership dues. Second statements have this year been sent to about 900 of the nearly 3,500 members. Failure of prompt payment is in practically all cases due to a negligence for which the Association must pay."

The Executive Council unanimously adopted a resolution expressing the deep indebtedness of the Association to the National Foundation for Education and particularly to Samuel R. Harrell, its chairman, for the generous support and invaluable assistance which the Foundation rendered in connection with the *Directory* project. The reports of the Secretary-Treasurer and of the Committee on Audit were approved by the Executive Council.

The budget for 1946 submitted by the Secretary-Treasurer estimated income at $19,165.00 and expenditures at $19,065.00. The detailed proposals for appropriation and the estimates of income from the various sources available to the Association were examined carefully by the Executive Council and approved without amendment.

Attention was directed by the President to the recent practice of publishing memorials in honor of deceased members in the REVIEW rather than presenting them to the Council and the annual business meeting. Managing Editor Ogg remarked that the Association had been particularly fortunate during the past six months in having little need for memorials.

The report of the Committee on Nomination of Officers for 1946 was presented by Past President Robert E. Cushman, chairman of the Committee on Nominations. The committee proposed for president Walter F. Dodd (Attorney, Chicago); first vice-president, Louis Brownlow (Public Administration Clearing House); second vice-president, Pendleton Herring (Harvard University); third vice-president, Arnold Brecht (New School for Social Research); new members of the executive council, Ralph J. Bunche (Howard University), Robert H. Connery (Catholic University of America), Charles McKinley (Reed College), C. Perry Patterson (University of Texas), and Harold S. Quigley (University of Minnesota). These recommendations were made after an advisory ballot (as provided by the constitution) of the Association, in which suggestions were submitted by 160 members.

A new and helpful feature of the report of the Committee on Nominations was a summary of principles and considerations which guided the committee's action. The Committee reported (1) that the advisory ballot was regarded as purely advisory and in no way binding upon the committee; (2) that it had aimed at a list of officers, both new and hold-over,

which would be well balanced in respect to geography and the various fields of political science; (3) that it had sought to avoid a concentration of official representation from the same geographical region or the same field of political science over a series of years; (4) that the Association does not choose its officers by promotion from lower rank, and that therefore the committee had avoided nominations which would seem to establish precedents for such promotions; (5) that, in view of the preceding principle, it had refrained from nominating to the vice-presidencies men who seemed likely next year to be seriously considered for the presidency; (6) that the Committee did not nominate any of its own members to any office; (7) and that in nominating members of the Executive Council, the Committee had refrained from naming persons who had served on the Council in recent years or who had already held higher office. The report of the Committee was received and approved by the Executive Council and the nominations referred to the business meeting of the Association for action.

The report of Frederic A. Ogg, Managing Editor of the REVIEW, indicated that Volume XXXIX (1945) contained a total of 1,256 pages of text as compared with 1,268 in 1944. The number of pages devoted to leading articles was 175, and the departments were represented by the following number of pages: (1) American Government and Politics, 179; (2) Constitutional Law, 51; (3) Public Administration, 26; (4) Rural Local Government, 12; (5) Foreign Government and Politics, 75; (6) International Affairs, 123; (7) Instruction and Research, 44; (8) News and Notes, 81; (9) Book Reviews and Notices, 286; and (10) Recent Publications of Political Interest, 156. Special features included 13 pages devoted to a list of doctoral dissertations in preparation, 20 pages to the report on Political Scientists and the War, and 15 pages to the volume index. Three issues during the year included group articles or symposia. This feature was introduced in 1943, and there has been a favorable reaction from the membership. The Managing Editor reported that conditions in the printing and publishing business are in many respects worse than during the war, but that the Banta Company has coöperated faithfully in the effort to have numbers of the REVIEW appear before the close of the scheduled month, so that during 1945 there were only two failures to attain this objective and by a margin of no more than ten days. It was felt that in view of the situation with other professional publications, this record had been commendable. The Managing Editor nominated Everett S. Brown (University of Michigan), Harwood L. Childs (Princeton University), Russell H. Fitzgibbon (U.C.L.A.), Charles C. Rohlfing (University of Pennsylvania), and Frederick L. Schuman (Williams College) to serve as members of the Board of Editors during 1946 and 1947; and the five nominees were duly elected by the Council.

The report of the Committee on the *Directory* of the Association, prepared by Kenneth Colegrove, was presented by Franklin L. Burdette, editor of the *Directory*. The report summarized the history of the project, which had been reported at vario[illegible]times during the process of compiling and publishing the *Directory*. A [illegible]ncial summary showed that, as of December 17, $2,335.41 had been collected from the sale of Directories and an additional $414.40 had been billed, leaving a deficit of $349.82 to meet the entire cost of the project. It was indicated that since the compilation of these figures many bills had been paid and that these payments and additional sales had brought the amount collected over the cost. Only a small number of copies now remain to be sold. The report indicated also that although the Executive Council had authorized the Secretary-Treasurer to draw upon the trust funds of the Association to meet the cost of publishing the *Directory*, it had not been necessary to use this authorization. This was due in part to the considerable advance sale and prepayment and in part to the rapidity with which the edition was distributed. The Committee recommended that a committee on the *Directory* be continued with authority to publish a second edition in coöperation with the National Foundation for Education upon terms substantially the same as those effective for the first edition. The Committee felt that the new volume should be published in 1947, or as soon thereafter as practicable, and that editorial work should begin during the year 1946. The Executive Council approved the continuation of the committee, with authority to continue or revise policies for the publication. However, the Executive Council felt that it would be unwise, in view of the large number of changes in location of members of the Association due to postwar enrollments, to begin the work of compiling a new edition during 1946. It was therefore requested that the committee study the question of date of publication and bring to the Executive Council a concrete recommendation at the next annual meeting.

Instead of regular reports from the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, the address of Waldo G. Leland at the dinner of the Executive Council and that of Charles S. Hyneman at one of the luncheon meetings of the Association were regarded as serving the same general purposes.

William Anderson presented the report of the Committee on Endowment. This consisted of the revised text of a brochure outlining the objectives and projects of the American Political Science Association and soliciting funds and bequests for such purposes. Further suggestions for revision of the brochure were invited. Dorothy Schaffter suggested that when published it should be placed in the hands of trust officers in banks and that it should contain a form for bequests. While no date was fixed for the publication of the proposed brochure, it was agreed that it should

be issued as soon as possible by the office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

The report of the Committee on Regional and Functional Societies was presented by the chairman, John E. Briggs. The principal concern of this committee during the year had been with sampling the opinion of members of the Association concerning the time and place of the meetings and their relation to sessions of cognate societies. A random sample was obtained from the *Directory* by taking each twentieth person in alphabetical order. To these members a questionnaire was sent asking a number of questions concerning the meetings of the national organization. Seventy-seven replies were received, including all fields of interest and all geographical areas in approximately the same proportion as in the total membership. According to this poll, 85 per cent approved the 1939 resolution to hold the annual meeting alternately in Washington, Chicago, and a third city: seven per cent were opposed, five per cent advised more flexibility, and three per cent had no preference. Opinion on the date of the annual meeting was partially influenced by the preference for meetings with cognate associations. Counting first choices only, 53 per cent preferred the Christmas holidays; 37 per cent voted for a date in the spring; and 10 per cent wanted the annual meeting in the fall. When second and third choices were included, the concensus of opinion was 49 per cent for Christmas; 34 per cent for spring; and 17 per cent for fall. Only 11 per cent of those replying wished independent meetings. Thirty-three per cent desired joint meetings with the American Society for Public Administration; 23 per cent with the American Economic Association; and 16 per cent with the American Historical Association. Meetings with other closely related organizations, such as the American Society of International Law or the National Municipal League, were supported by only 17 per cent. If joint meetings were to be held with related associations, 89 per cent preferred integrated programs.

In view of these expressed preferences of the members, the committee recommended (1) that the 1939 policy as to meetings be continued, depending upon convenience, available facilities, and the presence of a cognate association; (2) that the annual meeting be held in association with other social science organizations; (3) that the annual meeting usually be held during the Christmas holidays, but sometimes in the spring in conjunction with cognate societies; (4) that the programs of the associated societies be integrated as much as possible without jeopardizing specialized sessions such as those of the research panels; (5) that organized contacts with other social scientists be sought in regional conferences if national joint meetings are not feasible; (6) that members of the Political Science Association organize metropolitan and regional conferences for the discussion of professional interests and the stimulation of research. The report was received and filed.

Chairman Briggs also reported the organization of a District of Columbia Political Science Association and presented a request from that group that the American Political Science Association extend it official recognition as an integral part of the Association. It was pointed out by Ernest S. Griffith that the organization had no desire for a share of the dues paid to the national organization, and that the Washington group merely desired official recognition from the national body. He suggested that this newly formed organization might appropriately take the place of the Washington Committee, which has been in existence since the beginning of the war. Walter H. C. Laves moved that "The Executive Council looks with favor upon the establishment of local political science groups and instructs the Committee on Regional and Functional Societies to submit a plan to the next meeting of the Executive Council by which these groups can be properly related to the Association." The resolution was seconded by Clyde Eagleton and unanimously carried.

On motion of Clyde Eagleton, seconded by Frederic A. Ogg, the Executive Council adopted the following resolution in regard to the publications of the Department of State, presented by Royden Dangerfield:

"WHEREAS the times require a more ambitious program of publication of diplomatic papers than has hitherto been undertaken by the Department of State, and

"WHEREAS the political scientists of the United States have need for more complete documentation than has been made available in the past, and

"WHEREAS many of the series of publications of the Department of State should be expedited to meet immediate needs;

"BE IT RESOLVED by the American Political Science Association that the Secretary be instructed to inform the responsible officers of the Department of State that the Association endorses and supports the following publication program:

"1. *Foreign Relations.* It is believed that the public interest and the cause of scholarship require the immediate publication of the three volumes for the calendar year 1931, the five volumes for 1932, and the five volumes for 1933. All of these volumes are now compiled.

"It is the opinion of the Association that the lag in publishing the diplomatic correspondence should be greatly shortened. It is urged upon the Department of State that sufficient staff and funds be provided so that the diplomatic correspondence may be published no later than seven years following the dates of the documents.

"2. *Documents of the Peace Conference of Versailles.* These documents are needed by scholars and it is recommended that Volumes V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, and XIII, now in process, be published with all possible speed. Volumes I, II, III, IV, and XI have been published for some time.

"3. *The Miller Treaty Volumes.* No volumes of these important compilations of treaty texts and notes have been published since 1942. Since these volumes are of great value to scholars, the Political Science Association urges the Department of State to make personnel and funds available for the completion of this work at the earliest possible date. It is regretted that the work has progressed only to the year 1858.

"4. *German Documentation.* The Association endorses the State Department program of publishing German Diplomatic Documents illustrating the events leading to the war. It is recommended that recognized scholars be recruited from the universities in order that this project may be carried to early completion.

"5. *Treaty Collection.* Since Malloy's Treaties contain only those treaties and international acts perfected prior to 1938, the need for a fifth volume of the compilation is apparent. Moreover, the Malloy volumes are out of print and contain many inaccuracies. It is therefore suggested that the Department undertake to publish a compilation of texts of treaties and other international acts to supplant the Malloy volumes and to bring the set up to date.

"6. *Treaty Code.* It is recommended that the Department of State prepare a code of annotations to treaties to be published in loose-leaf form. Such publication would answer most of the questions concerning treaties raised by lawyers and scholars in the field.

"7. *Pamphlets.* The Political Science Association endorses the current Department of State policy of publishing in pamphlet form more important documents and policy statements. It is recommended that the number of such pamphlets published be increased and that every effort be made to extend their distribution.

"8. *Improvement of Distribution and Sales.* It is the opinion of the Association that every effort should be made to expand the sales of State Department publications. To this end it is recommended that the Department take steps to secure a change in the sales methods of the Government Printing Office which will permit private book stores to handle the sale of State Department publications in a more effective manner.

"9. *State Department Bulletin.* The members of the Association are pleased with the quality of the Department of State Bulletin and endorse the current policy of including therein important policy statements and diplomatic documents. The Association believes that every effort should be made to increase the circulation of the Bulletin. While the circulation list has increased from 500 to 1,500 in the past year, it is the opinion of the Association that the circulation should be extended far beyond that number. It is recommended that efforts be made to reduce the subscription rate to $3.00 per year and that subscriptions be sought through every available medium."

Discussion of this resolution developed the fact that it was parallel to one already adopted by the American Society of International Law. It was suggested that the adoption of the resolution be made known not only to the top officials of the State Department, but also to the congressional committees charged with approving the appropriation for the Department of State. A suggestion by Royden Dangerfield that the listing of State Department publications in the REVIEW be emphasized and that all important publications be given extended review was referred to Managing Editor Ogg for consideration.

Professor Dangerfield then presented a second resolution suggested by a recent action of the American Historical Association:

"WHEREAS many important diplomatic documents have not been available to scholars for long periods of time because it has been the general practice of Presidents of the United States, upon retirement, to remove considerable bodies of records from the Executive Offices, and

"WHEREAS the Federal Government has now made adequate preparation and is adequately equipped to service such presidential papers for the benefit of both scholars and government officials.

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the American Political Science Association expresses its earnest hope that the Presidents of the United States will consider their files as public property and will take with them upon retirement only such correspondence as is strictly personal in character or leave behind true copies of documents removed, and that they will enjoin other officials of the United States Government to do the same."

On motion of Robert J. Harris, seconded by Walter H. C. Laves, this resolution was adopted by the Executive Council.

In the absence of George B. Galloway, chairman of the Committee on Congress, President Gaus presented a written report on his behalf. This report was as follows:

"The Committee on Congress has been inactive during the past year. After a four-year study, your committee submitted a comprehensive report to the Executive Council on February 2, 1945. With the Council's permission, this report was subsequently published under the title *The Reorganization of Congress* and had a wide distribution.

"As a result of the activities of your committee and other factors, Congress adopted a concurrent resolution on February 19, 1945, establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which was directed to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the national legislature. The Joint Committee organized on March 3, 1945, chose its officers, and named the undersigned its Staff Director.

"During the past year I have perforce been preoccupied with the work of the Joint Committee, which filed its final report on March 4, 1946. Several members of your Committee on Congress testified at the hearings before the Joint Committee or submitted written statements. All but one of the recommendations we made a year ago appear in the final report of the Joint Committee. It remains for Congress to act favorably upon these recommendations and for political scientists to add their weight to the movement for modernizing Congress."

This report was received and filed by the Council after unanimous expressions of commendation of the Committee for its effective work in promoting the modernization of Congress. It was pointed out that the chairman of the committee had served during the year as Staff Director for the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress (the La Follette-Monroney Committee), and that the concluding luncheon on the program of the Association would be devoted to a discussion of this problem by the chairman and vice-chairman of this congressional committee.

President Gaus reported that when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Japan in the summer of 1945 and the existence of this weapon became known to the public, he felt it desirable to have a new committee of the Association for the purpose of following developments in this area and presenting a report to the Executive Council at its next meeting. The com-

mittee which he appointed consisted of Frederick S. Dunn (Yale University), chairman; Clarence A. Berdahl (University of Illinois); William C. Johnstone (George Washington University); Grayson L. Kirk (Columbia University); Walter H. C. Laves (Bureau of the Budget); and Amry Vandenbosch (University of Kentucky). Chairman Dunn reported for the committee that it had viewed as its function that of making some preliminary explorations of the services which the Association might render to its members engaged in research in the problems arising out of the development of atomic energy. The committee discerned two main areas of problems of direct interest to political scientists. First, they are concerned with the possibility of controlling atomic energy for military purposes. Second, they are interested in the implications of atomic energy for social and political relations and institutions in general. Neither of these areas falls exclusively in the domain of political scientists; hence it is to be expected that a large part of the activities in relation to atomic power will call for extensive collaboration with specialists in other fields. Thus is was felt that the first and most important service which a committee of the Association could render would be that of providing a channel of communication between its members working on problems related to atomic energy and the agencies representing other groups of specialists interested in the subject.

The advent of atomic power brought into existence a host of new organizations. These, the committee pointed out, fall into three groups: (1) those formed to promote some specific political program, (2) those formed to educate the public on the implications of the atomic bomb without reference to any particular action, and (3) those formed primarily to foster research in the problems arising from the development of atomic energy. It is with the third type that political scientists are most particularly concerned. The principal agencies of this type are: (1) the Committee on Social Aspects of Atomic Energy of the Social Science Research Council, under the chairmanship of Winfield W. Riefler, of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton; (2) the Advisory Committee on Atomic Energy of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, under the chairmanship of James T. Shotwell, with a branch committee at the University of California under the direction of John B. Condliffe; and (3) the Office of Inquiry into the Social Aspects of Atomic Energy of the University of Chicago, directed by Robert Redfield. It was felt that the first of these was most directly adapted to serve as an instrument of communication and collaboration between political scientists and other specialists working in the area of atomic energy. The chairman of this committee had already expressed his desire to make available the services of his committee to members of the American Political Science Association. In order to take advantage of this offer, the committee proposed

that a permanent committee on atomic energy be established by the Association to bring to the attention of members of the Association the facilities for research now being made available and to keep the Social Science Research Council committee and similar agencies informed concerning the work being carried on by members of the Association.

Pursuant to this recommendation, William Anderson presented the following resolution, which was adopted by the Executive Council:

"RESOLVED that the Association recognizes the grave importance of atomic energy to the nation and to all civilization, and hereby establishes a committee to be appointed by the President to make studies into the political and social implications of atomic energy; to make recommendations thereon; to coöperate with all other groups and agencies in the making of such studies; and to report to the Executive Council on matters relating to the interests of the Association in the problem of atomic energy."

The presentation of the report of the Committee on Atomic Energy and the adoption of the foregoing resolution led to extended discussion in the Executive Council. Walter H. C. Laves presented as a supplement to the report of the Association committee the report of the Special Committee on Implications of Atomic Energy of the Washington Committee of the American Political Science Association, under the chairmanship of William C. Johnstone, of the George Washington University. Dr. Laves offered the following resolution, based upon this report, for adoption by the Council and recommendation to the business meeting of the Association:

"The Executive Council recommends to the Association that it adopt the following resolution and give it appropriate publicity:

"The Philadelphia meeting of the American Political Science Association, noting the great urgency of finding adequate solutions for the social-political problems arising from the release of atomic energy, and having established a Committee on Atomic Energy to engage in studies and to prepare recommendations in this respect, (1) supports the efforts of the United States government to hasten the convening of the United Nations Commission on Control of Atomic Energy and Related Subjects; (2) urges the adoption of national legislation that will place the United States in a position fully and effectively to discharge any future obligations assumed in any agreement for United Nations control of the utilization of atomic energy; (3) affirms support for the principle of civilian control of any U. S. agency established for control of atomic energy and for consultation of all appropriate governmental and private agencies and persons, including the military; and (4) urges fullest and freest exchange of scientific information at home, and abroad by international agreement, as soon as suitable domestic and international security controls and safeguards are established."

It was suggested by a number of members of the Executive Council that such a resolution as that proposed would be a commitment of the membership of the Association on a controversial issue, contrary to the provisions of the constitution of the organization. In the extended dis-

cussion on the resolution, the urgency of the problem was pointed out, and it was felt that the influence of the political scientists of the country should be brought to bear before decisions were reached by the political organs of the national government. The resolution was finally approved by the Council by a vote of six to five and recommended to the business meeting. Those who opposed it wished to have it made clear that while they were sympathetic to the point of view expressed in the resolution, they felt that it was undesirable for the Association to take such action because of the precedent involved.

Professor Howard White presented a report of the Committee on the Social Studies concerned primarily with examination of the question, "How can political scientists maximize the contribution which they, as specialists in one large field of human knowledge, can make toward enriching the teaching of the social studies?" Following a number of suggestions to teaching members of the Association, to other members of the Association, and to other groups in coöperation with political scientists, the Committee made a number of specific recommendations. Two of these were (1) that the Association ask its Committee on the Directory to consider permitting members to list in succeeding Directories educational journals to which they have contributed scholarly articles, and (2) that the Committee on the Social Studies explore further the possibility of closer relationships with local, state, and regional Councils for the Social Studies and report thereon to the next annual meeting. Both were adopted. On the remaining recommendations, no action was taken; and the chairman of the Committee was asked to present these matters to the Association.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer submitted a report on the Personnel Service. Due to the problem of demobilization of the armed forces, it was considered desirable to issue in 1945 not only a basic personnel pamphlet but also two supplements. The basic issue was published in March; the first supplement appeared in July and the second in November. A considerable number of appointments resulted, particularly at the junior permanent staff level. There were also several appointments on a temporary basis (due to increased enrollments) to positions to be filled later by return of staff members then on leave for military or civilian service. The large number of new vacancies brought to the attention of the Association late in 1945, the early mailing of the bills for dues with which was enclosed a slip calling attention to the Personnel Service, and the considerable number of new registrants by the end of January, made an early publication of the 1946 service seem desirable. Thus the number for the current year, containing 58 names, was mailed early in March. It is anticipated that one or more supplements will be required during the year 1946.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer invited the attention of the Council to the job description of the profession of political science prepared with the assistance of a number of prominent political scientists by the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel. He also called the attention of the Council to the compilation of data concerning military and civilian war service of the members of the profession, published in the June, 1945, number of the REVIEW. He indicated that this report had been partial and incomplete and requested that corrections and additions be submitted. It was the consensus of opinion that the current year was too early to prepare a final report on this subject, and the project was therefore laid over for further consideration at the December meeting.

President Gaus reported to the Council that in order to have some one member of the Association responsible for following closely the proposals pending in Congress for legislation and appropriations in support of research, he had during the year asked Vice-President Dorothy Schaffter to assume this responsibility. He then called upon Miss Schaffter for a report. She summarized the various events which had taken place in Washington during the past two years with reference to this matter and reported that the legislation pending before the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate was S. 1850 by Senator Kilgore and others. This was an agreed bill incorporating the ideas of various authorities who have proposed measures of this nature, and it was expected that the bill would soon be reported to the Senate for action. The proposed legislation would create a National Science Foundation to which appropriations would be made for the promotion of basic research. While the bill was originally proposed and mainly supported by the natural scientists, the final agreed bill included provision for a division of social sciences. It was from the inclusion of this division that the immediate interest of the Association in the bill arose. Miss Schaffter reported that the natural sciences had already submitted extensive programs of research in support of the legislation, but that thus far the social sciences had not agreed upon such programs. One result is that in the bill it is provided that "until the Administrators of the Board have received general recommendations from the Division of Social Sciences regarding the support of research through that division, support of social science research shall be limited to studies of the impact of scientific discoveries on the general welfare and studies required in connection with other projects supported by the Foundation." It was suggested by members of the Council, following this report, that the Committee on Research of the Association be charged with responsibility for continued concern with this legislation and with the preparation of a research program which could be submitted to the Foundation in connection with the other social

science disciplines as a basis for a general program of research in the social sciences as contemplated by the bill.

Upon motion of Harold Zink, seconded by Frederick Dunn, the Executive Council approved the inclusion of the social sciences in the Kilgore bill and endorsed the statement made by the Social Science Research Council in the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs. This statement, which was presented by Wesley C. Mitchell, was in part as follows:

"The needs for research, and especially for the types of research which nongovernmental research organizations are peculiarly fitted to contribute, are so large that they far outrun existing financial resources on the scale on which these have heretofore been available. Research in the social sciences has been financed by a diversity of private, state, and federal funds. The increase in support required to realize as quickly as can well be done the potential values of social science research to our society and to the Government has little likelihood of materializing unless it is supplied by the National Government. Precedents for Government aid to research carried on by independent institutions are well established, notably in the field of agriculture and for war purposes.

"Questions of specific mechanisms whereby Government support for work in the social sciences can be provided under mutually satisfactory conditions have been and are continuing to be carefully considered by the Council. One satisfactory mechanism consists of the development of contractual relations with universities or other research institutions for individual research projects or work on a specified series of problems.

"The Social Science Research Council favors a program of Government scholarships for superior undergraduate students and fellowships for unusually promising graduate students. Such a scholarship and fellowship program should be planned to meet the needs for research personnel in the several scholarly fields, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities.

"The Council's position concerning the Government's research program rests upon the fact that a decision to support basic scientific research would fall far short of reaching its avowed objectives if by failure to include the social sciences it neglected to take advantage of the urgent need for greater knowledge in the social fields. If the Government's program is concerned with national defense and security, with national health and welfare, and with the nation's prosperity, any research agency which may be established inevitably will find itself dealing with research in the social sciences.

"The traditional lines of demarcation between the natural and the social sciences have little meaning when confronted with the research problems involved in the safeguarding of the human aspects of every major problem of national interest. Collaboration and coöperation among the sciences rather than an intensification of past rivalries and competitions is essential if the contemplated program is not to worsen the existing situation instead of achieving the goals set for it. The proposed research agency will be concerned with social science problems whether it so wishes or not; the only relevant and essential question is whether it will from the outset be able to deal competently with these problems."

Ernest S. Griffith presented a report for the Committee on Research indicating the progress made in the organization and conduct of panels

in nine areas of political science. He indicated that the Research Committee has conceived its rôle as that of a medium through which the members of the Association might pool their thinking on problems of research. The first and principal task which the Committee set for itself was to discover, analyze, and project the thinking of the Association as to the frontiers of research in its various subject-matter fields. The Committee anticipated that this task would be virtually complete sometime during the calendar year 1946. Other matters with which the Committee had concerned itself were priorities in wartime research and the state of research in the profession generally. In addition, some attention had been given to the better exploitation of the research facilities of Washington in general and the Library of Congress in particular.

As funds have not been available for the holding of meetings of the nine panels set up by the Committee, most of their business has been conducted by correspondence. However, two of the panels, Comparative Government and Political Theory, have published reports, and one is expected shortly from the panel on Public Law. More than 200 members of the Association have participated actively in correspondence on panel business and in such meetings of panels as have been held. Meetings of all of the nine panels were arranged for one day of the annual meeting. In concluding his report, Mr. Griffith alluded to the legislation pending in Congress for federal aid to research and suggested that the work of the Committee on Research could serve as a basis for the presentation of plans and projects to any federal agency created for this purpose. He felt that it might also serve as the liaison and coördinating body to increase the active participation of members of the profession in whatever projects were approved by such a body for execution.

In the discussion of the report, Mr. Griffith emphasized the immediate need for funds to permit panel meetings and said that the Committee planned to solicit such funds. He also suggested that the Committee desired to obtain funds for the purpose of making awards for outstanding contributions by members of the profession through research and publication. On motion of Frederic A. Ogg, seconded by Frederick Dunn, the Council approved the principle of such awards for research and requested the Committee to submit definite proposals to the next meeting of the Executive Council. Robert E. Cushman stated that he felt that research awards should be restricted to the younger men. Mr. Griffith agreed, but indicated that a principle of classification might be used so that the younger men would not have to compete for such awards with more mature scholars. He observed that the policies to be followed might be dictated by the conditions imposed by the donor of the award funds. In concluding the discussion, Mr. Griffith emphasized the need for training in group research and said that he believed that the Association might

take the lead in stimulating graduate students and university faculties to recognize this type of research as an acceptable alternative to the usual individual doctoral dissertation. This he thought was most important if political scientists are to make a significant contribution to the type of research project which is likely to arise under the provisions of the Kilgore bill.

W. Reed West, chairman of the Committee on Election Statistics, submitted a written report which was presented to the Council by President Gaus. The report indicated that because of some uncertainty in regard to the extent of the authority of the Bureau of the Census to carry on election studies, there was now under consideration for presentation to Congress legislation to provide a broader authorization to the Bureau to prosecute such work. The Governments Division of the Bureau has continued the publication of its election calendar, and the Committee reported that there was now some prospect for the publication of an elections yearbook for the two most recent national elections. On motion of Arthur W. Bromage, seconded by Clyde Eagleton, the recommendation of the Committee that the Council indicate its appreciation to the Director of the Census for the work that has already been done in the publication of elections data, and express the hope that the work may be expanded into an elections handbook as soon as possible, was unanimously approved by the Council.

The report of the Committee on Latin America was presented by Russell H. Fitzgibbon. He pointed out that this committee was unique in that its work was confined to the consideration of problems of a geographical area rather than a subject-matter area. Most of the work of the Committee has been exploratory. Its investigations so far have revealed a woeful lack of basic material, and the Committee is now attempting to expand the available material for research and teaching in the problems of Latin America. This effort includes a projected series of monographs on Latin American states and their governmental systems written from a realistic rather than a formal point of view. The chairman indicated that this project had the approval of former Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles and present Assistant Secretary of State Nelson Rockefeller. However, the funds needed have not yet been obtained, although efforts are being continued. The Committee is giving consideration also to a suggestion by J. Lloyd Mechem, of the University of Texas, for the establishment of a quarterly journal of the social sciences (other than history) for the Latin American area. It is likewise coöperating with the State Department in making recommendations on its translation program.

The report of the Committee on Latin America, coupled with the talk by Waldo G. Leland at the dinner meeting of the Council, led to a motion by Walter H. C. Laves, seconded by Frederic A. Ogg, that a new com-

mittee of the Association be appointed by the incoming president to concern itself with the interests of the American Political Science Association with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), with the United States Department of State on cultural relations, and with relations with political scientists in foreign countries. This motion was unanimously carried. It was pointed out in the discussion that it would be necessary for such a committee to coördinate its activities closely with those of the Committee on Latin America if overlapping were to be avoided.

President Gaus presented a letter and resolution from Francis O. Wilcox, chairman of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction in Political Science. This round-table group recommended that the Association provide for the appointment of committees for the following purposes: (1) to keep the Association informed upon the program for distribution of surplus government training films and to explore the various possibilities of sponsoring new training films to be used in political science courses; (2) to experiment with the development and publication of graphic-arts materials, such as charts and film strips for use in political science courses; and (3) to report to the Association on present techniques available for testing the knowledge of political science students and for evaluating teaching effectiveness through opinion measurements. President Gaus suggested that the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction be authorized to appoint its own subcommittees for these purposes, and this recommendation was approved. Howard White pointed out that the activities of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and of the subcommittees proposed by that committee should be coördinated with the activities of the Committee on the Social Studies, of which he is chairman.

President Gaus reported that the Committee on the Library of American Political Philosophy had been inactive during the year, due to its lack of success in securing funds for the publication of a projected series of books in the field of political theory. It appeared from the discussion, however, that there was some basis for hope that this project might still be achieved, and the committee was therefore continued.

A report on the activities of the Washington Committee for 1945 was presented by Charles S. Hyneman. Evidences of the activities of this group had appeared at numerous points in the discussions of the Executive Council, but may be summarized for emphasis. The program of the Washington Committee included a series of general meetings for political scientists in the Washington area, with such speakers as Representative Hatton Sumners, Senator J. William Fulbright, Senator Joseph H. Ball, Paul Appleby, Irwin Stewart, Donald Stone, and James Hart. The Committee took an active part in the discussions of social scientists in the District of Columbia concerning provision for the social sciences in the

legislation before Congress relating to federal encouragement of scientific study and research. An active part was taken in the development of the proposal for a Washington federation of social science organizations. The Committee took the initiative in the organization of the District of Columbia Political Science Association. A special subcommittee of the Washington Committee prepared a report on the Social Implications of the Atomic Bomb. Another subcommittee investigated problems of undergraduate instruction in political science. Mr. Hyneman felt that the creation of the District of Columbia Political Science Association made the Washington Committee less necessary, suggesting that the Association discontinue the committee and use the District of Columbia Association to represent it in any of its affairs in Washington and vicinity. President Gaus expressed deep appreciation to the Washington Committee for its assistance, a sentiment in which Managing Editor Ogg joined.

The question of the time and place of the annual meeting of 1946 was discussed at length. The Secretary-Treasurer reported that there seemed to be a general desire among the members for a return to the practice of Christmas meetings. His inquiries disclosed that neither Washington nor Chicago seemed favorable as a meeting place at that time, and that he had taken an option on the Hotel Statler in Cleveland for December 26 to 28, 1946. The Council expressed a preference for the dates December 27 to 29, and in view of the fact that definite information was not available as to whether the Association could be accommodated in Cleveland on these dates, determination of the time and place of the 1946 annual meeting was deferred.

President Gaus made a strong recommendation that the Executive Council plan to hold a meeting during the summer in order to promote better coördination and more adequate leadership in the work of its numerous committees. On examination of the budget, however, it was determined that there would not be funds available to pay the expenses of all members of the Council in travelling to and from such a meeting. On motion of Walter H. C. Laves, the Council endorsed the policy of a summer meeting of the Council provided such could be held without expense to the Association. Members of the Council will be canvassed later on their willingness to attend at their own expense.

The annual business meeting of the Association was opened on March 29 with a brief report by President Gaus on the discussions and transactions of the Executive Council. He indicated that detailed reports would be made to the business meeting on only certain items of the business of the Executive Council, but that reports of most of the officers and committees were available in mimeographed form for the use of interested members. He noted with regret the absence of two officers of the Associa-

tion—Second Vice-President James K. Pollock, who was in Germany, and Secretary-Treasurer Kenneth Colegrove, en route to Japan.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer presented the reports on the membership and finances of the Association, as well as the budget for 1946 which had been approved by the Executive Council. The report of the Committee on Audit was presented by chairman Walter F. Dodd, and on his motion, seconded by Walter H. C. Laves, the Association adopted a resolution of appreciation to Samuel R. Harrell, chairman of the National Foundation for Education, for his services and those of his organization in connection with the preparation and editing of the *Directory*. Managing Editor Frederic A. Ogg presented a brief report on the REVIEW and informed the members of the action of the Executive Council in electing five new members of the Board of Editors.

At the request of President Gaus, Vice-President Dorothy Schaffter reported to the members the progress of congressional legislation for federal aid to research (the Kilgore bill). As the Executive Council had approved the principles embodied in the bill, it was suggested that any members who cared to do so should present their views to Senator Kilgore or to Senator Elbert D. Thomas of Utah, chairman of the committee having the bill in charge, or to their own senators.

President Gaus reported to the membership on the actions taken by the Executive Council with reference to the problem of atomic energy. The resolution by Walter H. C. Laves on behalf of the Washington Committee and approved by the Council was presented to the membership for action. Mr. Laves explained the purposes of the resolution and Robert T. Crane argued that the resolution should not be adopted in view of the prohibition in the constitution of the Association against the making of commitments on controversial questions. On motion of Cullen B. Gosnell, seconded by Robert E. Cushman, the resolution was nevertheless approved by an overwhelming vote of the members present. On motion of Clarence A. Berdahl, seconded by Clyde Eagleton, the president of the Association was directed to forward a copy of the resolution to the President of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy, and other appropriate persons.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer reported that arrangements had been completed, pursuant to instructions by the Executive Council, to hold the forty-second annual meeting of the Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on December 27–29, 1946, with the Hotel Statler as headquarters.

Robert E. Cushman presented the report of the Committee on Nominations, approved by the Executive Council and referred to the business meeting. As there were no nominations from the floor, the report of the Committee, on motion of Isidor Loeb, seconded by Charles W. Shull, was

accepted, and the Secretary-Treasurer was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot of the Association for the nominees named in the report.

Under the heading of new business, a resolution submitted by the Panel on Comparative Government under the chairmanship of President Harold W. Stoke, of the University of New Hampshire, concerning the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, was referred to the Executive Council for later consideration and report.

At the final luncheon meeting, a vote of thanks was extended to President John M. Gaus and to Professor Raymond S. Short, chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, for their services in connection with the program and arrangements.—HARVEY WALKER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY-TREASURER.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Liberal Tradition; A Study of the Social and Spiritual Conditions of Freedom. By William Aylott Orton. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1945. Pp. xiv, 317. $3.50.)

The fundamental thesis of this book is that "the crying need of modern liberalism is for a clearer perception of principle" (p. 1). It is based upon the writer's assumption that principle, in the sense in which this word was understood by Jefferson and Lincoln and Gladstone has almost disappeared from present-day politics, being replaced by short-run, tangible objectives in which no long-run direction can be perceived. His purpose, however, is not to state a new principle but to direct attention again to a very old one.

For Professor Orton, liberalism is the political application of Christianity. It has its roots in the political philosophy of Aristotle, with its emphasis upon law and consent as the foundation of free life within a community, and in the Christian conception of a community of spiritual personalities, equal in the sight of God and possessing in themselves an absolute value. Accordingly, the arrangement of the book is in general historical, although the author imposes a running commentary upon the history which tends somewhat to obscure its continuity. It begins with the classical foundation and the Christian synthesis, which reached its height in the catholic vision of a universal human community in the Middle Ages. This unity broke down with the dissolution of the Church and the rise of national states. The true liberal concepts of community and of liberty in community were displaced by sovereignty and individualism, while the state became a secular organization for the exercise of power, without international control abroad and tending to subordinate to itself all other forms of association at home. In philosophy, the movement culminated in the materialist and positivist attack upon religion.

The concluding chapters of the book deal with contemporary applications of liberalism. Professor Orton accepts as accomplished fact the abandonment of two cardinal principles of British liberal policy, free trade and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, and he believes that this has dispelled all hope of peace or freedom. In their place we have the illusion of peace by force, which rests upon an impossible ideal of coöperation among national political units. Against this the author sets the "natural, logical, and salutary development" of international business organization. This he regards as representing a voluntary growth of functional internationalism, while the political control of big business is more likely to represent an aggressive economic nationalism. In domestic affairs, as Professor Orton believes, liberalism must aim at decentralization, with a larger opportunity for the small business man, and at the

restoration of a sound and independent agriculture. The only field in which the state can properly override free enterprise is the conservation of natural resources. The ideals of full employment and social security he describes as presenting "the mask of terror." "The primary object of economic activity is the production of goods and services, not the distribution of 'purchasing power' nor the 'creation' of employment; both these are secondary and consequential to the main function, and if they are made primary, free enterprise breaks down" (p. 294).

As Professor Orton conceives it, "the liberal tradition is a call to adventure: the adventure of growing up, becoming autonomous, living spontaneously" (p. 303). The present eclipse of liberalism he attributes to the fact that men are "too tired, too hopeless, too frightened" to respond to the call. But surely this is not a sympathetic, or even a fair, description of the aspiration that underlies present-day political radicalism. Nor does Professor Orton's version of liberalism represent in fact a very adventurous excursion into political thought. It leans heavily on Leonard Hobhouse, with more emphasis on religion, perhaps in the manner of John Neville Figgis or Lord Acton. But is it wise, in an age of world politics, to tie political idealism to a religious tradition that never belonged to more than a small fraction of the world's population? Or is it expedient to discard, or at least depreciate, international political organization because the national state has been defined as an organ of sovereign power? Or on the basis of fact, is international big business obviously more intelligent or more benevolent than political agencies? And does a small business man really live more spontaneously than a trade unionist? Or if a wage-earner wishes to be protected from the destructiveness of the business cycle—a destructiveness that can wipe out most of the values of free personality—is he necessarily a coward? In the great days of the tradition, liberalism attracted men because they were convinced that it meant to do something about political and social abuses. In its later versions, it produces the sense of being a little nostalgic.

GEORGE H. SABINE.

Cornell University.

Toward a Democratic New Order. By DAVID BRYN-JONES. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1945. Pp. iv, 288. $3.50.)

During the past few years there have appeared numerous works on the principles and philosophy of democracy. Most of them, however, have been either analyses of its *idées maîtresses* or reminders and exhortations as to democratic beliefs and convictions usually stated in contrast and opposition to fascist ideology. What has long been needed is a sober, seasoned account of democratic theory and argument; of the genesis, development, and significance of the various elements in the democratic

tradition; of the practical realization of democratic aspirations; of the difficulties, hindrances, false ideas, and established attitudes and institutions which pervert or prevent effective democracy; of what is needful under the conditions of modern industrial civilization that democracy be made effective; and, above all, of the problems of relating the democratic state to an effective world order.

It is these issues that Professor Bryn-Jones tackles, and, within the limits of a work of modest size, handles with success. He brings to the task theoretical acumen balanced by practical insight, a fund of good sense, a careful avoidance of preaching, and an unusual capacity to recognize, without under- or over-estimating, both the difficulties and the factors favoring democratic society. He writes well and interestingly, and his scholarship is used to illuminate rather than oppress. He is successful in relating historical ideas to current problems, and he reveals the relation of democratic government to underlying social institutions. He makes clear, while eschewing dogmatism himself, the need to emancipate ourselves from the particular dogmas of nineteenth-century economic liberalism if we are to solve the issues raised by inegalitarian capitalist society. He sees the need for some form of industrial democracy and for the elimination of extreme economic inequality and of irresponsible economic power if political democracy is to be soundly and securely based.

Yet he is not an advocate of pure equality, but insists on the functional justification of inequalities. He realizes the dangers of statism and bureaucracy, while accepting the necessity of the positive state. He is concerned with the protection of the rights and liberties of the consumer and of the still-forgotten, unorganized citizens generally. He is, also, pungently aware of the dangers of undemocratic behavior, internally and externally, of organized groups, such as trade unions, while aware no less of their contributions to the realization of political and economic democracy. He sees how nationalism and political democracy, serving together, have at times led to the perversion of the latter by the former. He analyzes interestingly the relation of nationality to nationalism, as well as the general minorities problem; realizes that statehood cannot always constitute the solution; sees the value of cultural diversity, based on freedom; and makes suggestive proposals for solution of the problem consonantly with the needs of world order and the ethics of democracy. He discusses the problems of "have" and "have-not" nations, indicates the solution of international economic planning and controls thereto, shows the results of imperialism in harming and helping backward peoples, and suggests the general lines for an international policy which, without naïveté, may yet treat peoples in a way consistent with democratic profession and aspiration. In all this last section, he makes abundantly clear the need for democracy itself, to create an ordered and peaceful, but not a static or rigid,

world order and organization.

Organizationally, the work is admirable. The first part, concerned with "The Liberal Tradition," insists that democracy, which must be government, not paper principles, has to combat the totalitarian appeal by realizing its nature and stealing its thunder, while at the same time remaining true to its own ethos. Professor Bryn-Jones then argues positively the superiority of government based on, and institutionalizing the expression of, the popular will, with a decent respect for, and effective guarantees, in attitude as well as law, of the rights of individuals and groups, as a means to promote and realize, within human limitations, the general welfare of mankind.

The second part, devoted to reëxamining fundamental democratic ideas, deals with the limits of toleration, and, while properly appreciating the formal value of defining liberty as absence of restraint, analyzes, without falling into philosophical errors, the positive conditions necessary today that men may enjoy substantively widened range of choices made possible by modern civilization, knowledge, and technology. The fundamental importance of equality to democracy is made clear, and the relation of genuine equality of opportunity to the realization of a degree of actual equality, as well as the proper meaning of the latter, is very soundly stated. Rights are discussed with significant emphasis on their changing content and on how they actually get, and can get, translated from claims into social and legal fact. Finally, the author shows that fraternity, internal and international, is not idle sound, but an essential element in democratic theory and a necessary attitude for democracy's functioning.

The third section, concerned with reinterpreting and applying the principles developed in the first two parts, analyzes two major types of issues: the relation of existing industrial organization and economic power, especially in capitalist and democratic countries, to democratic society and government; and the relation of national states and a world order to the realization of democracy. On this it need only be added that the author combines realism, fairness, and lack of ungenerous prejudice with a recognition of the need for major changes, in institutions and attitudes, practical generalized suggestions as to what may and should be done, and an idealism which, while generous, is undeviating in its uncompromising insistence on fundamental principle. Indeed, the great value of this work is its combination of principle with tolerance; its recognition of continuing values from the past with an emphasis on the need to change and adapt, as well as abandon; and, above all, its sane recognition of the value of ideal ends as criteria in a world of fallible humanity, doomed to fall short of their achievement.

THOMAS I. COOK.

University of Washington.

Fate and Freedom. By Jerome Frank. (New York: Simon and Schuster. 1945. Pp. viii, 375. $3.00.)

This stimulating book is described in a sub-title as "a philosophy for free Americans." In his preface, the author modestly deprecates the accuracy of the description. A more correct sub-title, he explains, would be this: "Some materials for and some gropings toward a philosophy for Americans who believe in freedom." The interested reader will not be disappointed, therefore, if he fails to find in this volume a systematic and comprehensive philosophy, either metaphysical or social. But he will find a moving plea for a social ideal, which the author terms "a new synthesis, one which combines individual enterprise and the medieval spirit of cooperativeness."

Judge Frank's method of presenting his case is to attack the theories of the historical determinists, particularly the Marxists. His book is at the lowest appraisal a substantial contribution to the growing body of American anti-Marxist literature, and it challenges comparison with the productions of such significant writers as Sydney Hook and Max Eastman. But Frank is not a philosopher like Hook nor an artist like Eastman. He is a lawyer with a lawyer's zeal for exposing the fallacies of his opponent, and with more than any ordinary lawyer's equipment in alien fields of learning whence he skillfully draws fresh materials in support of his argument. Regarded as a polemic directed against Marx, Hegel, and the Nazis, this book is timely and efficacious.

Judge Frank's argument, however, goes beyond the theories of Marx and Hegel and deals with the whole notion that the course of human events is governed by natural laws. "The world's future depends on human purposes," he declares, "not on fate." He quotes with delighted approval Justice Holmes' dictum that "the mode in which the inevitable comes to pass is through effort." He assails the "inevitablists" with all the weapons of the experienced controversialist. But instead of a reasoned demonstration he concludes with an assertion of faith, "faith in the power of free men to preserve a civilization in which freedom will seem to have been inevitable—because free men will have effectively willed that it should persist."

This faith is traditionally pleasing to Americans. We like to believe that men's conscious and deliberate purposes have to some extent affected the past, and can also to some extent affect the shape of the future. But is there such a sharp conflict between Americans' natural faith in themselves and interpretations of history which recognize the validity of at least the possibility of scientific laws in the realm of human behavior? Kant, from whom Hegel derived his inspiration but of whom Frank has little to say, contended that, whatever metaphysical theory may be formed regarding the freedom of the will, it holds equally true that the

manifestations of the will in human actions are determined, like all other external events, by universal natural laws. Kant thought it worth while to try to discover the hidden purposes of nature, preferring "the guiding light of reason" to the "cheerless gloom of chance."

At this point in the argument Frank is less convincing than when he deals with Marx and the Nazis. He seems not to try to go beyond the will to believe in his articles of faith and to search the ultimate foundations of faith itself. Lacking further interest in philosophy, he might have fortified his faith with poetry. We commend to him Milton's famous statement of the relations between freedom of the will and fundamental law (*Paradise Lost*, Book ix):

> "But God left free the will, for what obeys
> Reason is free, and Reason He made right."

ARTHUR N. HOLCOMBE.

Harvard University.

Los Partidos Politicos, Instrumentos de Gobierno. By LINARES QUINTANA, SEGUNDO V. (Buenos Aires: Editorial "Alfa." 1945. Pp. 839.)

The author of this work is one of the most distinguished of Argentina's students of government. Though still a young man, he is the author of nine books or booklets and dozens of magazine articles dealing with the processes of government in Argentina, the United States, and Europe. His *Derecho Público de los Territorios Nacionales* has been generally accepted as the standard work on its subject.

Now he offers to political scientists, and to such others as may be interested, a well planned and well written study of political parties—their nature and functions, and the extent to which they have been subjected to public control. Attention is centered on the Argentine scene, but generous space is given to a description of conditions in the United States, as well as several other countries of Latin America and Europe.

The book starts slowly, as do so many Latin American studies of government. Opening chapters point out the desirability of honest elections and the need for political parties in a democratic way of life. The nature of political parties is discussed at some length, and reinforced with the definitions of numerous authorities, from Edmund Burke to Edward M. Sait. The conclusions reached by the author at this point are sound, but certainly not original.

After these introductory hurdles have been cleared, however, Dr. Linares Quintana really hits his stride. In a brief but remarkably lucid chapter, he traces the development of political parties in Argentina. Then, broadening his horizon once more, he discusses at length the problems encountered by democratic nations in their attempts to regulate parties and party activity. There are chapters dealing with the establishment

and organization of political parties, the manner in which they perform their functions, and, finally, the various ways in which they cease to exist.

Dr. Linares Quintana is concerned only with democratic and pseudo-democratic states. He makes no attempt to consider totalitarian one-party systems. His foreign examples are drawn primarily from the United States, but also from Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, Nicaragua, Cuba, Switzerland, and prewar Czechoslovakia. Primarily, of course, he is interested in his own country, and his explanations and references are related to Argentine conditions.

American readers who look for criticisms of the present Argentine régime will look in vain. Dr. Linares Quintana makes the tacit assumption that the existing government is honestly concerned with the maintenance of free elections, and he proceeds from this point to discuss the manner in which free elections may be assured by state regulation of improper party activities. No suggestion is made that the government itself may be guilty of improper activities. Nor is it reasonable to assume that the author could have adopted any other point of view—not if he expected to remain in Argentina and see his ideas in print.

Indeed, it is highly probable that Dr. Linares Quintana believed exactly what he wrote at the time when he wrote it. The revolutionary government had created a committee to draft a law regulating party activity, and had announced that this was a first step in the direction of honest elections. There was no question of the need for such a law; it had been advocated time and again by virtually all leading Argentine students of government. At the time the committee was created, Dr. Linares Quintana was made its secretary. Shortly after the committee finished its work, this book on political parties was published. The outlook for a restoration of the democratic way of life seemed to be fairly good. But then, only a few months later, Dr. Linares Quintana severed his long-time connection with the government—a post in the Library of Congress—in protest against the ruthless policies of the military régime. Evidently his dream of an early return to constitutional government had been rudely blasted.

Although this volume shows no trace of the present turmoil, it does provide an excellent background for an understanding of the current political scene. It will be welcomed by all students of party activity, and by all who are interested in the governments of Latin America.

AUSTIN F. MACDONALD.

University of California.

The Growth of Constitutional Power in the United States. BY CARL BRENT SWISHER. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1946. Pp. x, 261. $2.50.)

This is the sixteenth volume in the "Studies of American Institutions"

series published by the University of Chicago on the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation. In this collection of ten lectures, originally delivered at Chicago in the spring of 1945, one of our foremost authorities on the American constitutional system has set down his thoughts and conclusions on that subject in systematic fashion.

It must be said at once that no one at this late date is likely to provide an interpretation of our constitutional system which is at the same time sound and entirely new. On the other hand, Professor Swisher's analysis of his subject is so orderly and complete, and his material is presented in such readable and convincing fashion, that this becomes one of the most successful and useful compilations of essays on the Constitution that is now available.

In his first chapter, Mr. Swisher states the dilemma fundamental to every constitutional system in a democratic state: Can simultaneous attempts to establish political power and to restrain its exercise produce a workable and successful compromise between authoritarianism and anarchism? The author observes that "the concern of the critic is principally as to whether the constitution provides enough power or adequately efficient methods for its exercise to achieve the ends of the society it is intended to serve." Thereupon he proceeds in four chapters to a careful analysis and evaluation of the principles of federalism and checks and balances, and of the sources of and barriers to power in our Constitution. He then turns in four further chapters to certain somewhat more special problems of our constitutional system: administrative justice, civil liberty, foreign policy, and the rôle of the judiciary in interpreting the fundamental law.

In all of these chapters, Mr. Swisher's findings are generally on the optimistic side. He accepts the premise that government must maintain a vigorous, positive program in the modern age; he does not minimize the archaic and inadequate aspects of our Constitution or the inhibiting influence of some of its restraining clauses; but he concludes that our Constitution still serves as an adequate foundation upon which to build a successful political life for our nation. What he says of checks and balances is typical of his conclusions: "As to the suggestion that the entire structure of our government ought to be reorganized, however, and the device of the separation of powers eliminated, the case is at least not yet proved." And again, " . . . the fact remains that, whatever the stresses and strains within the interstices of our governmental system, the results achieved entitle it to distinction not inferior to that of any other government in the world."

It is in the last chapter that the book's most original contribution is to be found. Here Mr. Swisher comes to grips with the development of "private government" in the United States (and on the international scene), chiefly in the form of great corporations. He raises the issue of our

ability under the Constitution to deal with the vast power of these agencies and to find ways and means of identifying such power with democracy, as to both the mechanics of its exercise and the ends it serves.

It is no reflection on the scholarship or profundity of this book to state that its greatest usefulness will perhaps be to the general reader, and to students in classes in American government. No political scientist has yet produced an abler non-technical, yet critical, analysis of our constitutional system than is to be found in Professor Swisher's volume. It deserves, and undoubtedly will enjoy, a wide audience.

ROBERT K. CARR.

Dartmouth College.

Full Faith and Credit; The Lawyer's Clause of the Constitution. By ROBERT H. JACKSON. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1945. Pp. 60. $1.00.)

This brochure is a republication of the fourth annual Benjamin N. Cardozo Lecture before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, delivered December 7, 1944. In his discussion of the full faith and credit clause, Mr. Justice Jackson gives a review of the historical evolution of the clause antedating its inclusion in the Constitution of 1787, and through the first period of legislative activity in interpreting the document. A general outline of the present decisional status of the clause occupies a dozen pages, and these are followed by a brief discussion of Canadian and Australian experience in dealing with the same general problem that is dealt with by the full faith and credit clause.

In the concluding pages of the brochure, the author states his opinion that the full faith and credit clause has never been given its full effect by either Congress or the Supreme Court. The author agrees with a number of other writers, such as Professor Walter Wheeler Cook, Professor Edward S. Corwin, and this reviewer, that Congress could by legislation do much to clarify the law relating to both the effect and execution of judgments given in the state courts. But Mr. Justice Jackson fears that traditional state and common law prejudices and assumptions of American lawyers will prevent timely and adequate intervention by Congress. He turns to judicial decision as the only hope for rectifying the present state of anarchy in the relations between the numerous courts in the judicial system of the United States.

This is a thoughtful discussion of full faith and credit and its relationship to the federal system, and it will repay careful perusal by students of American government and constitutional law.

OLIVER P. FIELD.

Indiana University.

The Management of Your Government. By HAROLD D. SMITH. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1945. Pp. xiii, 179. $2.50.)

The director of the United States Bureau of the Budget, "largely as a result of continued urging by his associates," has put forth in this small volume a dozen of his occasional papers and speeches. It is altogether appropriate that Eric Johnson, as president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, should praise the substance of the volume and the work of its author as coming from "one of our most competent and devoted public servants," because Mr. Smith has deliberately couched his chapters to reach the average intelligent citizen-taxpayer and to instill in him a better understanding of the workings of his government.

Three of the papers deal with over-all management. Mr. Smith emphasizes the common top problems in government and business (in government it is called "red tape," in business it is called "system"). Indeed, he pleads for schools that will train for both business and public administration. He emphasizes the concern of administration with the satisfaction of human needs—gadgeteering is not enough—and makes clear how much administration is still an art. He deplores "the preoccupation of the managerial profession with techniques, methods, and means . . . some of . . . [them] have a high abstract intelligence in their technical field, but not a very high social intelligence."

Four essays deal with the budget office as a tool of management and executive control. Mr. Smith traces the evolution of the budget to the point where it seeks to be the work program of the government with a dollar sign, and he makes clear the importance of control of execution as well as of formulation of the program. He recognizes possible conflicts in the aspects of the budget as a tool of legislative control and of executive control, but believes that the two needs can be reconciled. He states eight canons of budgeting.

A final group of papers expounds the federal budget as an instrument of fiscal policy management, as a tool of national planning for high level employment and economic stability. It is gratifying to see Mr. Smith state firmly the need for "adequate planning facilities in the Executive Office," which "the Bureau is not presently equipped to engage in." (In one of the earlier essays, he says: "The problem is not one of setting up an independent central planning organization. Rather, it is one of adequately organizing and staffing the Presidency.")

With the terrific responsibilities that Mr. Smith has carried during the war years, it is amazing that he has found time for even these papers, in which he reveals the soundness and breadth of his understanding of the rôle of management in a complex society, expressed simply and lucidly, with no punches pulled. A more systematic exposition based upon his

uniquely rich experience must probably wait until he retires to that farm in Virginia.

CHARLES S. ASCHER.

New York City.

Civil Service in Wartime. EDITED BY LEONARD D. WHITE. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1945. Pp. 253. $2.50.)

The lectures collected in this volume were delivered at the University of Chicago during the winter quarter of 1945, under the sponsorship of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation. The views of ten authors are presented on such diverse subjects as "The Search for Executive Talent," "The Nation's Professional Manpower Resources," "The Control of Government Employment," and "The International Civil Service of the Future." With the exception of Professor Ranshofen-Wertheimer's paper on the latter subject, all deal with some aspect of wartime manpower mobilization; and all were written by persons who played prominent parts in that challenging and strikingly successful undertaking. Their recorded experiences and mature judgments merit the careful consideration of all our citizens.

Few stories are more fascinating than that of the mobilization of this democracy for total war. The collective effort it required cracked the crust of custom everywhere. It led to entirely new ways of doing old jobs and to results which were demonstrably impossible. In all fields of endeavor, striking innovations were usual. In many, they were the rule. But with all of the pressures and the changes to which they gave rise, we managed to preserve democratic principles and democratic institutions.

The story of the civil service in wartime cannot be considered apart from this more general setting. Indeed, as Professor White observes in the opening chapter of the volume, the civil service provides essentially "a case study in institutional adaptation to a crisis of unparalleled magnitude." One measure of that adaptation was the spectacular increase in the size of the federal civil service: from 920,000 in June, 1939, to 3,302,000 in June, 1944. Another is to be found in the modifications made in traditional methods of recruitment, selection, and classification.

The most significant procedural changes occurred, of course, in connection with selection and the recruitment process. A service expansion of the magnitude required in the time allowed could never have been achieved through traditional methods. Recognizing this inexorable fact, the Civil Service Commission modified its regulations in 1942 and abandoned assembled examinations and ranked registers for the duration. At the same time, it decentralized its operations to its regional offices and welcomed the recruiting assistance of other agencies. As a result, administrators throughout the government combed the country for executive

talent. The National Research Council and other private agencies assisted in the recruitment of scientists. The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel mobilized the professions and other specialist groups. The United States Employment Service, as the principal operating arm of the War Manpower Commission, helped staff the government arsenals and shipyards and the atomic bomb projects of the Manhattan District. The first steps in the mobilization process were the elaboration of recruitment agencies and the simplification of selection methods, amply described in this volume. While the Civil Service Commission retained its central responsibility for the public service, it multiplied its arms and altered its traditional standards.

Whether the civil service deteriorated in the process is a matter of opinion. Professor White is inclined to think that it did so. My own judgment is that it did not, except in the lower clerical grades where the manpower shortage was quantitatively most noticeable. Elsewhere, the intensified recruitment and stream-lined selection procedures brought into the service a group of "ardent innovators" and of hard-hitting administrators unparalleled in the history of the government. The search for executive and professional talent was particularly successful, and while the low salary ceiling has forced many of the wartime appointees out of the service since VJ-day, there was much in our experience in recruiting and selecting them which might well be carried over into the postwar world.

Indeed, as Louis Brownlow suggests in a paper summing up the successes and failures of the civil service during the war years, the unwillingness of the Civil Service Commission to continue that flexibility and adaptability which characterized it during the war "presages a failure of the civil service institution to meet the needs of peace." Whether this will, in fact, prove to be the case remains to be seen. The return to ranked registers, required by veteran's preference legislation, suggests, however, that many of the salutary lessons of the war years may already have been lost.

The papers in this volume do not adequately chronicle the mobilization of our manpower resources for war. There is, for example, no real consideration of the over-all rôle played by the War Manpower Commission. Moreover, the papers do not present a unified point of view. It is difficult for the reader to discover any fundamental cohesion among them, except that all deal with some aspect of the employment process. Despite these limitations, the volume is indispensable for anyone who would understand either the transformations undergone by the service in wartime or the probable direction of evolution in the postwar years.

J. Donald Kingsley.

Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Federalism and Regionalism in Germany; The Division of Prussia. By ARNOLD BRECHT. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. xvi, 202. $2.50.)

The Regions of Germany. By ROBERT E. DICKINSON. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. ix, 175. $3.50.)

These two small volumes admirably supplement each other, although Brecht's is definitely the more important for the political scientist. Indeed, Dickinson contains a good deal of descriptive detail which any geography of Germany, or indeed of Europe, will provide, and which, therefore, should be familiar to the better-informed student. Still, it is handy to have this descriptive piece of geographical analysis; for it provides all the background needed for Brecht's penetrating study of the federal problem.

In a sense, Dickinson's treatment is already obsolete, because it was written before the decisions at Potsdam tore off the Eastern regions of Germany which he so skillfully describes in Chapters VIII and X, and which he shows so effectively to have been an integral part of the German economy and of the German nation's patrimony. The morals of vengeance aside, Dickinson's study ought to go a long way in raising doubts in the reader's mind concerning the wisdom of dismembering Germany by taking the provinces of East Prussia, West Prussia, Pomerania, and Silesia from her. A political settlement involving the breaking up of Germany into a number of separate states, such as was advocated by Sumner Welles, will appear clearly less violent an operation. Dickinson states no conclusions, but his survey of the several regional economies indicates how such a regional break-up might have been accomplished, if it had been felt that future security made it desirable. (It is the present reviewer's considered opinion that the facts do not support this contention.)

Brecht explicitly states that a break-up would be contrary to our interest in the development of a democratic Germany. He says: "Nothing could be more detrimental to liberal trends in German reconstruction than a situation in which popular demands for national reunion would place democratic governments of separated Germanic states in the dilemma of having either to espouse or oppose such demands" (p. 140). To the present reviewer, this appears an exaggeration. If a genuine international cohesion such as Welles wanted us to promote had been available as a framework for such states, the situation might still have been difficult, but could probably have been resolved. It is the failure of our government to fashion a genuine American policy for the democratization of Europe that leaves us with the present impasse.

Whatever the reader's views on these tortuous and vexing questions, he cannot but profit from Brecht's sane and thoroughly documented description of pre-Hitlerite Germany's efforts to resolve the complex legacy

of its monarchical federation. No one can speak with greater authority than Brecht, who himself played such a central rôle in these efforts to assimilate Prussia to a federally decentralized democracy in which its provinces would increasingly occupy a position comparable to that of other "countries" (Länder). His analysis falls into five parts: political factors, powers and practice, reform, decentralization, and constitution vs. totalitarianism. After a skillful comparison between American and German federalism, he shows the political factors to have been primarily three, the residual power of Prussia, the counter-balance of Bavaria, and the regional differences in political opinions, which show a decline in democratic sentiment as you move from West to East, rather than from North to South. For one of the real teasers in the situation was precisely the democratic strength of the parties of progress in Prussia as against the authoritarian tendencies of the parties of reaction entrenched in Bavaria. It is to be hoped that our colleagues who have lately specialized in political propaganda will ponder the realities of Prussia, which contained both the most progressive and the most reactionary forces, and stop dishing out the catchwords drawn from the Bismarckian age and popularized in World War I.

After a brief general survey of German federalism in practice (Chap. VII), Brecht gives a detailed and highly informative account of the plans for the reform of the federal system and administrative decentralization—plans which had progressed far enough to cause Brecht to hint that it was Brüning's grave error of dissolving the Reichstag on July 18, 1930, (Brecht politely calls it "a momentous step") which prevented the Chancellor from introducing the constitutional amendment already drawn.

The reader catches a sense of tragedy as he follows Brecht's turning to "regionalism under Hitler." The further complications which Hitler's thinly disguised centralism has brought about do not prevent Brecht from advocating a return to federalism, to be fashioned along the lines of the Reform Committee's plans. That means (1) the division of Prussia, (2) the reëstablishment of the Federal Council, and (3) the abolition of states with fewer than two million inhabitants. He would let a popularly elected assembly determine the details. How much of such a program can be realized under the Four-Power condominium which has been imposed upon Germany—now divided into four zones which cut across all historical and economic boundaries—Brecht does not pretend to discuss. But political scientists who are interested in realistically analyzing this unprecedented experiment in undemocratic government of a modern industrial nation as it unfolds its weird pattern will find much that will help them in the detached and well-informed study which Brecht has given us.

CARL J. FRIEDRICH.

Harvard University.

Wartime Mission in Spain, 1942–1945. By Carlton J. H. Hayes. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1945. Pp. viii, 313.)

When Mr. Hayes went to Madrid as ambassador in May, 1942, it seemed very possible that Spain might enter the war on the side of the Axis, or at least permit German troops to cross her territory to attack Gibraltar. The purpose of his mission, as he conceived it, was to prevent either of these events and to obtain every possible facility for our own economic and political warfare. This book records the Embassy's success in attaining these ends. Before Mr. Hayes left Madrid, the Spanish government had abandoned many of its pro-Axis policies and had been compelled to agree to a long series of measures helpful to the United States.

Mr. Hayes does not claim all of the credit. He feels that Spain, in its own interest, desired to stay out of the war, and he emphasizes the importance of the economic weapons which the United Nations had at their disposal. He also emphasizes the Germans' misjudgment of Spanish character and the moral ascendancy which the United Nations attained by a fair and honorable policy. Finally, he gives unstinted praise to his associates on the Embassy staff.

The Ambassador was evidently not quite so well satisfied with the support which he received from the Department of State. At critical times he was hampered by a failure to receive urgently needed instructions or by the sending of instructions which did not seem to take into account the realities of the situation. Divided councils in Washington and pressure from anti-Franco public opinion apparently made it difficult to deal effectively with Spanish problems. Furthermore, the State Department failed to reach a clear agreement with the British government as to policy in Spain, and this was reflected in lack of teamwork between the Allied Embassies at Madrid.

Mr. Hayes especially resented the fact that emotional opposition to the Franco régime in the United States at times prevented concessions which he regarded as essential to the achievement of important objectives. He "understood and thoroughly sympathized with the widespread repugnance throughout democratic America to General Franco's dictatorship, with its Fascist trimmings and its earlier pro-Axis orientation"; but he felt that "if the journalistic critics of our Spanish policy knew the real facts about the situation here, and were as intent upon winning the present war against the Axis as they are upon continuing the seven-year-old Spanish civil war, they would be more charitable and less voluble." Influenced perhaps by this feeling, he says little about the more objectionable aspects of the Franco régime. His own relations with the government were pleasant. He feels that the present situation is unsatisfactory, but that it should be corrected by the Spaniards themselves, without out-

side interference, and that the United States in the meantime should maintain friendly relations with the existing régime.

Many will disagree violently with these opinions and with the whole policy by which Mr. Hayes sought to make Spain an asset rather than a liability to the Allied cause. Even those who dissent most strongly, however, should be able to read the book with interest and profit. It is an important contribution to the history of the war and a fascinating picture of war-time diplomacy.

DANA G. MUNRO.

Princeton University.

Russia and the Western World. By MAX LASERSON. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1945. Pp. x, 275. $2.50.)

The search for a *modus vivendi* with the Soviet Union promises to be one of the dominating preoccupations of the Western World in the postwar years. Already voices of despair cry out that coöperation is impossible, that any concessions to Soviet claims represent appeasement, and that the expansionist thrust of the Soviet Juggernaut must be checked immediately if Soviet power is not to overflow the world.

One of the very solid merits of this study by Professor Laserson is that it keeps its head. Professor Laserson is optimistic about the possibility of maintaining a *rapprochement* between the Soviet Union and the Western World, but his is a reasoned optimism which neither overlooks difficulties nor brushes aside obstacles. The underlying premise of his analysis is that the Soviet Union has discarded goals of world revolution and that the key to Soviet policy is to be found in the desire to safeguard the stability and security of the Soviet state. As Professor Laserson sees it, the rediscovery of Russian history, the rehabilitation of the family, the revision of Soviet jurisprudence, the recognition of the Orthodox Church, and the stress on patriotic ideology all fit into a pattern that is basically conservative and stabilizing in its effect. The resurgence of national consciousness, which was intensified by the war, will, he thinks, persist into the postwar period. But he does not regard it as necessarily dangerous to the peace of the world. In foreign policy, he argues, the accent has been and will continue to be on reclaiming "the Czarist heritage."

Professor Laserson does not envisage Soviet foreign policy as dynamism without limit. The expansion of Soviet borders which has already taken place and the construction of a chain of "friendly" buffer states projecting into central Europe and middle Asia represent for him the outer limits of Soviet claims. Such a sphere of influence within which Soviet power would be predominant need not, in Laserson's view, endanger Great Power collaboration nor block effective Soviet participation in

international organization. Fundamentally, Professor Laserson bases his hopes of future peace on a willingness of the Great Powers to confine their major operations within the spheres of influence which they have demarcated and to adjust and compromise their rival aspirations in the event that they overlap or collide. To state the problem thus is perhaps another way of saying that the architects of the future peace will have to develop skills for which history has no precedents.

Professor Laserson has written a scholarly book which clarifies the position of the Soviet Union today by setting it in the historical perspective of Russian political and social evolution. He commands Russian sources and has used Soviet and pre-Soviet periodicals and books to make available material on Soviet jurisprudence, historiography, and federalism which has hitherto been accessible only to those who read Russian. It is regrettable that the somewhat turgid and forbidding style of this volume may deny it the audience which it otherwise deserves.

MERLE FAINSOD.

Harvard University.

Nationalities and National Minorities. By OSCAR I. JANOWSKY. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1945. Pp. xvi, 232. $2.75.)

Professor Janowsky's book represents an effort to find a solution to the problem of national minorities in the great borderland between Russia and Central Europe, which has so frequently been an area of international friction, and, indeed, furnished the immediate occasions for the First and Second World Wars. As the author points out, the model of the national state, to which Western statesmen have usually referred in dealing with the complex minority questions of Eastern Europe, is inapplicable in a region characterized by the lack of homogeneous nationality groups. A workable alternative, in the opinion of Professor Janowsky—who has had opportunities to study at first hand the issues discussed in his book—might be found by adopting the concept of "national federalism."

The essence of the idea of "national federalism" is that national groups within a given country would have their rights to their own language and cultural institutions recognized on a group basis—rather than on an individual basis, as was the case under the minorities treaties concluded after World War I—and enforced by the United Nations Organization. That such multi-national states can be successfully established, Professor Janowsky believes, is attested by the experience of Switzerland, the Union of South Africa, and the U.S.S.R.

Since Switzerland—so often the political scientist's Utopia—is a small country with a unique historical development, the description of the workings of multi-nationalism high among the Alps is not particularly convincing. The South African record also fails to establish an imposing

precedent, since participation in the political life of the Union is virtually restricted to the Boer and British populations, with most of the natives remaining beyond the pale. The chief interest of the book therefore, lies in its analysis of the "national federalism" of Soviet Russia, particularly since Russian influence is now paramount in Eastern Europe.

That the Soviet authorities have succeeded in coping with the problems arising from the presence of nearly 200 distinct nationalities, or fragments of nationalities, within the confines of their state, no one will deny, particularly in view of the cohesion which the peoples of the U.S.S.R. have just demonstrated in the war. The unity that the Czars tried and failed to establish by forcing non-Russian groups to conform to Russian cultural institutions, the present government has achieved by means of a policy of cultural diversity.

What is debatable, however, is Professor Janowsky's belief that the U.S.S.R.'s program of cultural freedom for national groups can be so easily detached from the ideology of Communism that the former can be marked for export and the latter reserved for the Soviet Union's consumption. As the author himself points out, the Soviet government, unlike its Western counterparts, has found its basis in a unified working class rather than in a homogeneous national group. Accordingly, Soviet leaders believe not only that the term nationality can apply only to the laboring masses of a given people, but that workers of different nationalities have more in common than do the workers and the middle class of the same nationality. It seems clear, therefore, that the U.S.S.R.'s concept of a multi-national state is directly related to the Communist view that diverse national groups can be welded together on a class basis. By means of the leadership of the Communist party and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the U.S.S.R. achieves unity despite national diversity.

Professor Janowsky's efforts to distinguish between the Soviet Union's cultural program and its political and economic institutions undoubtedly spring from his desire to analyze his particular problem more clearly. But his insistence on this distinction also appears to indicate his reluctance to recognize the leadership now being exercised by local Communists from the Balkans to the Baltic, lest he appear critical of Russia's expansion in that area. The result is a somewhat confused approach to events in Eastern Europe in the wake of the war; for the enormous changes which are taking place there—not the least of which are those relating to minorities problems—are being conducted under Communist guidance. In Yugoslavia, for example, Marshall Tito is using the Communist party to link up the country's various nationality groups, to which he has extended cultural autonomy. Professor Janowsky would, therefore, have made a more realistic appraisal of the type of solution that is now being given to the minorities question if he had been more candid about the

rôle of the Communist party in Russia and the Eastern European countries as the centralizing force in culturally decentralized nations.

WINIFRED N. HADSEL.
Foreign Policy Association.

New Frontiers in Asia. By PHILIP JAFFE. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1945. Pp. 375. $3.00.)

Mr. Jaffe applies the term frontier to an area rather than a boundary. His Asiatic frontier countries are India, China, and the Southeastern Asiatic colonial areas. His exposition is "based on the premise that, although the United States has emerged from the war with the most developed internal market of any country in the world, this internal market cannot possibly absorb the enormously increased productive capacity of American industry and agriculture. . . . Only the exploitation of new and hitherto undeveloped and under-developed external outlets for capital and industrial goods can be effective in maintaining the high levels of employment and national income attained during the war" (p. 3). This premise is established to show the importance to the United States of the development particularly of India and China. In the case of India and the colonial countries, it is used to justify American interest in the solution of problems sometimes held to be outside the proper limits of American activity.

The book falls into three parts. The author first examines the problem of development of India. Second, the possibilities of development of China are explored. In the third section, the treatment of postwar Japan is considered, followed by a discussion of British Imperial policy in Asia and of the Far Eastern policies of the Soviet Union.

The author is critical throughout of British policy, holding it to be an impediment to the realization of legitimate American trade and investment purposes, as well as to the attainment of independence for India and the colonial dependencies. Their independence he holds to be essential to the development of an expanding world economy. His treatment, however, is objective rather than subjective. As a matter of fact, Mr. Jaffe presents rather persuasively the case for Britain's holding on to what she has, if the operative premises should prove to be those of power-politics and a non-expanding world economy.

As to China, the author is equally critical of Kuomintang policies and methods and of American policy as it has played into the hands of the reactionary elements of the Kuomintang. He is also critical of American policy toward Japan as it was apparently developing prior to the Japanese surrender. His critical judgments are much less sharp and acute in treating the Soviet policy and that of the Chinese Communists than when he is dealing with the British. That is possibly because their immediately

avowed objectives are not so much at variance with his thesis concerning the American interest, since he holds that these new frontiers can be developed as external outlets for American production only if primary emphasis is placed on raising the living standards of the masses. This can be anticipated, according to the author, only if the political mechanism of democracy is accepted and utilized. Thus he argues that in China the issue is not Communism but the development of democracy.

The book presents so vigorously an integrated point of view that any reader can find things in it with which to disagree. It is, however, a book which those interested in the problems of Asia, and of American policy, will find both stimulating and rewarding.

HAROLD M. VINACKE.

University of Cincinnati.

A Guide to the Practice of International Conferences. By VLADIMIR D. PASTUHOV. (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1945. Pp. xi, 275. $2.50.)

This useful work is No. 4 of the *Studies in the Administration of International Law and Organization* recently published by the Division of International Law of the Carnegie Endowment. It is a fitting companion to the other two principal English works on its subject, Dunn's *Practice and Procedures of International Conferences*, and Hill's *The Public International Conference*, both published in 1929. Mr. Pastuhov disposes of a large body of documentary materials with an easy hand and style, and with the experience of one who has been a member of the League Secretariat, an officer attached to the International Labor Office, and an official of UNRRA. The result is a readable account of a technical subject. The work is thoroughly informative and substantially complete without aiming to cover the minutiae of every conference held between the two world wars.

The principal conferences discussed are those of the League, the I.L.O., the American States, and the United Nations; but important materials are drawn also from many other conferences. After classifying international conferences as intergovernmental, semi-public, and private, Mr. Pastuhov discusses the procedures for convoking and preparing for them; the agenda; selection of place and date; staffing and budgeting (none of them as simple as they sound); and gives an interesting analysis (pp. 63–65) of the necessity of preparation and the dangers of over-preparation. The structure of conferences is then treated in sections on their composition; the credentials of participants; presidents and vice-presidents; steering, main, and technical committees; and the secretariat. The complex web of conference meetings is sketched in sections on plenary and committee meetings; publicity; right to address the conference; languages; proposals

and amendments; previous questions and closure; voting; elections; and even protocol and entertainment. The documentation of conferences is discussed in sections on memoranda, motions, resolutions, and amendments; reports of commissions and rapporteurs; minutes and verbatim reports; approval of records; the League of Nations technique in editing documents (singled out for deserved praise); final instruments; the language of treaties; and "follow up." There are seventeen appendices of important illustrative texts, comprising sixty-seven pages; a "Select Bibliography of Secondary Materials"; and an index.

There is little public understanding of the scope and complexity of the organization and administration of a general international conference. Such a conference is a large enterprise, much of whose machinery is ordinarily assembled in haste for a few weeks' work at high pressure, and then dismantled. Improvisation is needed, even with the experienced secretariats and more or less standardized procedures of the continuing international organizations. Mr. Pastuhov has contributed a book whose learning leads always to the main things. It should be welcomed by students and by both new and practiced delegates to international conferences. Perhaps some enterprising information officer will even recommend its reading to gentlemen of the press, in the hope of improving the stories they wait for in the lobby.

LLEWELLYN PFANKUCHEN.
University of Wisconsin.

The International Secretariat. By EGON RANSHOFEN-WERTHEIMER. (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1945. Pp. xxvii, 500. $4.50. Distributed by Columbia University Press.)

The Headquarters of International Institutions. By C. WILFRED JENKS. (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1945. Pp. 102. 6s.)

Just as the study of abnormal psychology gives new insights into the behavior of normal men, so Mr. Ranshofen-Wertheimer's study of international administration throws new light on the administrative process in general. This work deserves a permanent place in the literature of comparative public administration. The discussion of the League of Nations secretariat's relations with the city of Geneva and the effect of these relations on the working efficiency of the secretariat is suggestive for the student of morale problems in administration. The chief administrative officer's relations with his governing body, on the one hand, and his subordinates, on the other, is considered in terms of the contrasting behavior of Sir Eric Drummond and M. Albert Thomas.

The experience of the higher directorate of the League's and the I.L.O.'s secretariat in infusing with a sense of common purpose such an extremely heterogeneous body of men is perhaps especially worthy of

study. To steer between the Scylla of national contingents each jealous of its own share in the patronage and the Charybdis of cosmopolites and *déracinés* incapable of understanding or withstanding national pressures grew increasingly difficult in the League's later years.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations Organization, like his predecessors in the League and like heads of administrations everywhere, will have grave difficulty in preserving a general expectation that promotion will be based on merit if in fact the more responsible positions have to be filled with considerations of patronage and national prestige uppermost. He will also find it difficult to protect his secretariat against the dispiriting effects of pressures for economy and rationalization. These pressures will be peculiarly depressing to a group so specialized that its skills cannot be fully employed except within the narrow confines of international organization.

The volume is, of course, of great topical interest. It deserves a painstaking examination by Mr. Trygve Lie and his chief associates in organizing the UN secretariat and in recruiting its personnel. There are sins both of omission and of commission which may be avoided if the evidence of League experience which Mr. Ranshofen-Wertheimer has assembled is carefully weighed.

Mr. Jenks, in his study of the location and status of the headquarters of international institutions, concludes that the limited system of exterritorial rights and immunities granted by the Swiss government to the League were inadequate. He wants the independence of its successor to "rest upon a contractual and not upon a physical basis." Since, however, the free operation of an international institution in a crisis would still depend on treaty arrangements with its immediate neighbors, the importance of formally detaching UN headquarters territory from the sovereignty of the host state may be over-estimated.

Of special interest to the present residents of Westchester and Fairfield counties will be Mr. Jenks' discussion of the comparative advantages of a "District of Columbia" and a "Vatican City" size for the headquarters area. For this reviewer, Mr. Jenks clinched the argument for the more diminutive area when he quoted the remark attributed to Cardinal Gasperri in explaining the tiny size of Vatican City: "We did not wish to be confronted with a tram strike." He himself would favor a larger area if the financial resources of the organization should be adequate to maintain it.

There is evidence in both works that in the crisis of 1938–40 Swiss neutrality would have interfered with the effective operation of League machinery, had the anti-Axis forces chosen to act collectively through the League. This may help to explain the decision to place UN in a country which is an indispensable member of the nuclear alliance around

which that organization's enforcement arrangements must be organized.

WILLIAM T. R. FOX.
Yale University.

International Cartels. By ERVIN HEXNER. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1945. Pp. xiv, 555. $6.00.)

This book, while not exactly a brief for the defense of international cartels, is certainly in the nature of a minority report on the vexing problem raised by this form of marketing coöperation among private entrepreneurs across national lines. The author is convinced that many of the unfavorable conclusions commonly reached in discussions of the cartel problem are based on a woeful lack of information. He continuously insists upon the necessity for more facts as to the actual operating methods of cartels and their effects on production and prices. Hexner has, indeed, himself sought to fill in this void, first by his volume on the international steel cartel, and now by devoting over 200 pages of the present volume to case studies of collective marketing controls, followed by another 150 pages of cartel documents and agreements.

It is upon these case studies that Hexner's general analysis of the cartel problem, which constitutes the first section of the book, is based. He recognizes that the term cartel has unfavorable connotations in the public mind, and he believes that a more objective examination of the field could be insured if a new and emotionally uncolored term—he suggests "private collective marketing control"—could be substituted for cartel. The definition which he presents, to bring out the broad constituent elements of the cartel concept, is this: "A cartel is a voluntary, potentially impermanent, business relationship among a number of independent, private entrepreneurs, which through coördinated marketing significantly affects the market of a commodity or service."

With respect to the various evils with which cartels are customarily charged, Hexner's tendency throughout is to suggest that they may not be as bad as they are painted if we get all the facts. The international steel cartel, for example, was not concerned with limiting potential production. He agrees that restrictive measures which contract production or supply are "probably" socially undesirable, but adds that "there may be cases in which self-restriction is necessary in order to increase the volume of world trade in the long run, to coördinate the use of natural resources, to stabilize employment through the business cycle, or for other reasons." He feels that understanding will be improved if analysts "abandon the theological claim to certainty" on these matters, even on the question "whether free enterprise implies the freedom to refrain from competition." He stresses the impermanent character of cartels, and their lack of machinery for enforcement. He concludes that, except for a few cases,

there is no evidence that the actions of business men coöperating in cartels "was contrary to the general business ethics existing at that time," but he readily agrees that "this business ethics urgently needs revision." He is likewise not much disturbed about the political uses to which cartels may be put, for he does not believe that entrepreneurs belonging to different nations have pursued common political objectives in their international marketing coöperation. But he adds: "It is clear that certain industrialists in democracies unwittingly supported the enemy in their business transactions."

Hexner makes certain recommendations as to international cartel policies which will safeguard their operations. He stresses, for example, the need for comprehensive publicity on cartel policies, the representation of consumers on the executive bodies of international cartels, the illegalizing of cartel price discrimination and private boycott measures against countries by international convention, and the maintenance of conditions not inimical to the entry of outsiders into the market.

Hexner has performed an important service by demanding that views as to cartels be based, not on slogans and prejudices, but on solid factual foundations. He rightly stresses the potential uses of the cartel device of coöperation among private enterpreneurs as an alternative to complete government domination of foreign trade. But many readers will take a somewhat dimmer view than does the author as to the past record of cartels and the future possibilities of preventing their use for restriction of production, price-fixing, and improper political purposes.

C. HERMAN PRITCHETT.

University of Chicago.

Black Metropolis; A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City. By ST. CLAIR DRAKE AND HORACE R. CAYTON. With an Introduction by Richard Wright. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1945. Pp. xxxiv, 809. $5.00.)

This is an outstanding contribution to the study of Negro life in urban America. The authors have dedicated the volume to the late Robert E. Park, but they have departed far from his teachings. Dr. Park was a great admirer and believer in the methods and philosophy of Booker T. Washington of Tuskegee Institute. Messrs. Drake and Cayton have thrown the Tuskegee approach out the window. They are uncompromising in their demands for unconditional racial equality.

The Introduction by Richard Wright is brilliantly written, but it contains many alarming ideas. Mr. Wright, it appears, is a great admirer of the late Adolf Hitler—not of his racial policies, but of his ability to exploit the hunger and longings of his people. As Mr. Wright puts it: "History will no doubt dub the Hitlerites as the most devasting critics of

our disorganized industrial order, not even excepting the Bolsheviks of 1917! Hitler knew his industrial slums, knew the brutalized millions trapped in them, knew their hungers, knew their humiliations, knew the feverish longing of their hearts." He goes on to characterize the Nazi film, *Triumph des Willems*, as one of the greatest documentary films ever produced. What are the implications of this extraordinary point of view? Does Mr. Wright admire Hitler's use of deceit and violence? Does he advocate the revolutionary tactics of Toussaint l'Overture, Henri Christophe, Denmark Vesey, and Nat Turner?

The book is encyclopaedic in its information about the Black Belt of Chicago. There is no phase of life in this community which the authors have not covered. The physical and psychological barriers which hem in the community are illustrated in great detail and with skill. Social, political, occupational, religious, and sex color-lines are discussed by means of numerous case histories.

The chapter on "Democracy and Political Expediency" contains an excellent discussion of the politics of a minority group. President Roosevelt's dramatic appeal for votes at a Chicago meeting in the 1944 campaign is graphically described. The description of the 1943 aldermanic campaign left the reviewer puzzled. If Oscar DePriest won the election by means of a write-in campaign, this was a political miracle, since write-in campaigns are most difficult to conduct and almost impossible to make stick if the election officials are hostile. The authors do not indicate whether the DePriest campaign was a write-in one. The sequence of events which they relate would call for such a campaign.

In the chapters on "Advancing the Race" and "Of Things To Come," there is a discussion of leadership and political methods. It is made clear that the authors have no admiration for "safe leaders." The evidence which they present that this type of leader is passing away is unconvincing. Their analysis of the organization of discontent and of campaigns for jobs is very well done. While they state that the prevention of racial outbursts is not their primary interest, they present this program: "(1) the continuous interpretation of the Negro's aspirations and demands to all sections of the white community; (2) the actual progressive relaxation of discrimination and segregation, beginning immediately; (3) the inclusion of Negroes in all postwar plans on an equitable basis; (4) the strengthening of social controls—familial, associational, and governmental—within the Black Belt; (5) the constructive channeling of the Negro's mass resentment into successful patterns of non-violent protest."

The "Methodological Note" by W. Lloyd Warner, of the University of Chicago department of anthropology, is a fine contribution to the volume. His table of comparisons between the Deep South and Black Metropolis puts in convenient form a wealth of material on color-caste in the United States.

While the book is very voluminous, it is to be regretted that the authors did not use some of the public opinion research methods which Samuel Stouffer, of the University of Chicago sociology department, has employed with such success in the Army in studying racial attitudes.

The book is well illustrated with charts, and it has scholarly notes.

HAROLD F. GOSNELL.

Washington, D. C.

BRIEFER NOTICES

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

James Truslow Adams alleges that *Big Business in a Democracy* (Scribners, 1945, pp. 291, $2.75) may be his "swan-song" in the writing of American history. If true, many who have found stimulation in his earlier volumes will regret that he has chosen to offer this rambling, chatty, and unsubstantial study to be remembered by. The book is largely concerned with the General Motors Corporation as an example, possibly the best example, of the type of big business which the writer declares is an inevitable function or result of democratic conditions peculiar to America. No one questions the value of assessing the rôle of large-scale enterprise in the American, indeed in the world, scheme of things; one asks only that the task, when undertaken, be done fairly and fully. Before paying his respects to GM (and without compensation from the management), Mr. Adams takes to task the reformer who loses sight of perspective and expects human nature to change as swiftly as science and technology. This calls forth a brief synopsis of the long story of man's emergence from the pack to become a profit-motivated, competitive individual. Then in a few more pages we are told how business enterprise in America came to differ so remarkably from its European ancestor. Except for shadows cast upon good works by certain unscrupulous "robber barons," business kept expanding and spreading its benefactions until the late depression caused many Americans, though not the "real" Americans, to succumb to the "coddling" philosophy of the New Deal. However, all is not yet lost, and Mr. Adams feels reasonably confident that in the future the people will force their government to cease trying to plan and run everything and instead to serve as the umpire between labor and management. A big business like GM is said to be democratic because it accords special privilege to none, supplies its customers with goods and services of a high quality at low cost, and affords all its employees an equal chance to get ahead. A career open to talents is what Mr. Adams calls economic democracy. One doubts whether Walter Reuther would agree, especially in view of the author's assertion that big unions must be forced to obey the law and to abide by their contracts just as much as big businesses. Mr. Adams considers a most important question, namely, the desirable relations of capital, management, labor, and government in a modern

democracy, but in handling it in such general terms and in regarding communism as the only alternative to private enterprise, he falls short of making a significant contribution. While *Big Business in a Democracy* may give some small satisfaction to the executives of General Motors, it will hardly convince a large proportion of the citizen-audience for whom it was written.—LUTHER J. LEE, JR.

For those who read as they run, it is useful occasionally to have a succinct and accurate summary of the events and trends that influence the flow of developments in the labor world. The developments in that world from 1940 through V-J day are depicted in Aaron Levenstein's *Labor Today and Tomorrow* (Knopf, pp. 253, $2.75), with further analyses of the issues and conflicts that will generate tomorrow's problems. The author is a former labor lawyer now associated with the Research Institute of America, and he is well equipped to deal with the topic in hand. The product is excellent and reliable. The story begins in the defense period and follows through the expanding controls of the war period. The consequences of the division of labor into several organizations, as well as the rôle of the Communists and the Catholics, are summarized. A chapter is devoted to President Roosevelt's part in the labor world. The final section is devoted to the emerging issues of tomorrow, and it is shown that the crucial issue relates to the expectation of less than full employment, with its ramifications into the division of the available jobs among a larger number of men. Organized labor, it is shown, does not have a philosophy that provides an answer to that problem, and it salves its conscience by approving the Full Employment Bill which is tied to private enterprise—which has no solution either. The potential conflicts with the veterans are discussed and the principle of super-seniority a là Selective Service Administration is subjected to devastating criticism. The topics considered bring into the scene the rôle and program of management, and these are given their proper significance in the whole development. The use of the Montgomery Ward case as the extremist position does not weaken the book as some reviewers have suggested. The author is content to report and offers no solution for the problems which he delineates.—CHARLES B. HAGAN.

In the decade since publication of Ordway Tead's *Creative Management*, the language of administrative management has become almost commonplace and the techniques of coördination have become widely known and used. Now Mr. Tead, in *Democratic Administration* (Association Press, 1945, pp. 78, $1.25), has added to his original handbook on coördination a new section dealing with some philosophical implications of bureaucracy. Mr. Tead is convinced that we can have the highly de-

veloped bureaucracy needed for efficient organization of industrial society and still keep both the values and processes of democracy. He develops this theme for the layman and practitioner rather than the student of administration. Science must be fully utilized. The instruments of production must be administered on a huge scale. We must admit as a permanent feature of modern life economic and functional governments within the state. "All that we have to do is move into this area of corporative organization with the idea of universal, democratic, economic citizenship under constitutional government as the basic premise of our effort, our structure, and our motive." It is a good deal easier to identify the aims of democracy, and even its essential processes, than to prescribe for their realization. Mr. Tead is very clear about what is needed: separation of policy-making from policy execution; recognition that the process of determining purpose and method is multiple and shared, while the process of oversight and direction is single and unified. Mr. Tead further rules out general voting on technical issues, aggravation by party alignments of differences in administrative policies, and election of administrators by those whom they supervise. Listing these requirements gives an illusion of simplicity which is heightened by such statements as, "The good leader loves the led and in so doing he calls forth loving behavior of the led in the directions which he suggests . . . an enlightened loving attitude can permeate human relations without weakening the fabric of group discipline . . . dynamic administration includes the task of personality creation." It is to be hoped that Mr. Tead's ideas and experience will soon be put into a systematic development of the thesis which he outlines here in rather evangelistic terms. Meanwhile, the importance of infusing democratic values into modern administration cannot be too widely circulated.—MARY T. REYNOLDS.

Students of public administration will find *Lectures on Administrative Regulation* (Public Administration Publications of the Graduate School, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, 1945, pp. viii, 76) very useful. Practical administrators often do not publish any analysis of their activities. The regulatory agencies exercise wide discretion, and their procedures are developed through precedent. The statutes, annual reports, published orders, or court decisions present an incomplete and often distorted impression of the work inside the agency. In the present lectures, five administrators, already familiar as writers, describe in brief and cogent manner some practices in their particular agencies. Lloyd K. Garrison, C. W. Kitchen, Jacob Rosenthal, Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., and Fowler Harper discuss, respectively, regulatory procedures in war labor controls, agricultural marketing and food distribution, war production, price administration, and the coal industry. The series, arranged by John Thurs-

ton under direction of Eldon Johnson, is introduced by Ashley Sellers in a general discussion of the administrative process. Paul H. Appleby presents the conclusion; and a reprint of an article by Joseph B. Eastman is included. While certain agencies considered are transitory and peculiar to wartime situations, their experiences constitute an important basis for a general understanding of the regulatory process. Each lecturer considers the extent of government authority, the rule-making procedure, the participation of private groups, and the enforcement techniques. The public servant, in his attempt to coördinate the general interest with technical needs, has encouraged private interests to assist in the formulation of public policy and the administration of sanctions. The studies are primarily descriptive rather than critical.—FRANCES P. DELANCY.

Sales Taxes and Other Excises (Public Administration Service, 1945, pp. xiv, 216, $3.00), by Roy G. Blakey and Gladys C. Blakey, is a welcome addition to current reference materials on the subject of state taxation. Professor and Mrs. Blakey present a careful factual treatment and a concise evaluation of state sales and use taxes, gasoline and other motor fuel taxes, alcoholic beverage taxes, cigarette and other tobacco taxes, and chain store taxation. The method followed in their study is to describe the types of taxes found in each of the several categories, and with respect to each to analyze methods, costs, and problems of administration; to show yields and to explain their disposition or distribution; to point out trends; to summarize relative merits; to comment on shifting, incidence, and other economic effects. The monograph deservedly pays considerable attention throughout and in special chapters to the impact, either actual or probable, of the federal constitution and the federal government on the field of general and special sales taxation. The authors properly call attention to the importance of coördinating the fiscal policies of our governmental jurisdictions. Their observation on the postwar tax situation in the state governments is timely and in view of recent clamoring for reduction of state taxes deserves quotation: "The pressure for more state and local revenues will probably be greater than ever, hence most states will undoubtedly be slow to reduce or give up their sales or other taxes; the pressure will be to increase them. The main chance for relief for state and local taxpayers lies in the hoped-for lessening pressure of federal postwar demands upon the national income and a successful war-to-peace conversion of the general economy, followed by continued maintenance of high production and relatively full employment." More than sixty tables of statistical or carefully digested data, together with fifteen illustrative graphs or charts, interpolate the discussion. There is an appendix, which includes a bibliography. A carefully prepared index adds immeasurably to the utility of the volume. There are two slight

inaccuracies, one with reference to the type of sales tax tokens used in Missouri (p. 13), and another with reference to the yield of the sales tax imposed by New York City (p. 5). Professor and Mrs. Blakey give us an exceedingly well-balanced, carefully organized, and realistic presentation of highly complex material. The truly scientific spirit which pervades the work greatly enhances the value of their observations and conclusions. Since general and special sales taxes now constitute the major source of state revenue, students of government and taxation as well as tax administrators will find invaluable this up-to-date volume.—MARTIN L. FAUST.

It would be a great help to students of budgeting if the budgetary practices in all state governments were written up in the authoritative and comprehensive manner of *The Kentucky State Budget System* (University of Kentucky Press, 1945, pp. 103, $0.50), by James W. Martin and Vera Briscoe. Dr. Martin has described and evaluated the steps in the development of budgeting in Kentucky since the turn of the century. He tells why Kentucky did not have a satisfactory budget system under the act of 1918, and why the governmental reorganization act of 1936 really made possible the first major advances in budgeting. The latter act, it may be recalled, made the governor responsible for the general direction of the state administration, set up a department of finance as a staff agency to assist the governor in budgeting and other financial processes, authorized the governor to secure technical help in installing a modern accounting system with adequate budgetary controls, and made possible the establishment of an effective post-audit. While Dr. Martin thinks that Kentucky has made notable progress in budgeting since 1936, he is frank in saying that further improvements are desirable, such as the elimination of many earmarked receipts, the establishment of a trained budget staff, and a broader conception of the budget as an instrument of general planning and management. He feels that Kentucky lags behind some of the other states in its utilization of the budget as a means of getting the most service for each dollar spent rather than of merely preventing illegal expenditures. Disregarding Dr. Martin's excellent advice on special funds, the people of Kentucky recently adopted a constitutional amendment earmarking for highways all gasoline taxes and automobile licenses.—A. E. BUCK.

New York Advancing (New York: Municipal Reference Library, 1945, pp. xxxv, 393, $1.00), edited by Rebecca Rankin, continues the story of the La Guardia administration begun by two volumes of the same name issued in 1936 and 1939. The three volumes together constitute a factual, comprehensive, and somewhat eulogistic survey of the twelve years of

New York's colorful reform mayor. The most recent issue covers the achievements of the last seven years of the La Guardia régime. It is an attractive, readable paper-covered volume, replete with effective "before and after" photographs. It is compact and factual and offers a mine of information about the city, its government, and the plans drawn for its future. Prefaced by a final statement from the Mayor himself, the volume proceeds to record progress borough by borough and department by department. The value of the material accordingly varies somewhat. In general, the chronicle of achievement is impressive even during the war years, and, if one may forgive the ebullience of some contributors in their eulogy of their picturesque chief, the story is well told for a volume of this kind. One may question whether "The City of New York has done all it possibly could to assure the continued progress and well-being of the city" (p. 124), but still approve the notable progress made. As a piece of municipal reporting, this volume, like its predecessors, is valuable to citizen and student. It is the only readily available single chronicle of what the city government has been doing these seven years. It would have been a better report with a little less self-adulation, and if it had a final section on problems and issues as yet unvolved. However, this volume with its predecessors constitutes a landmark in municipal reporting in New York City. It is to be hoped that the present and future administrations will continue the practice.—WILLIAM J. RONAN.

The United States After the War (Cornell University Press, 1945, pp. 180, $2.50) contains recent addresses at Cornell, with an introduction by Dean C. W. de Kiewiet. Though heavily weighted on the economic side, the lectures speculate also on political activity in such fields as social planning (Alvin H. Hansen), agriculture (F. F. Hill), organized labor (Louis Hollander), business (Walter D. Fuller), and education for citizenship (George D. Stoddard). In "Power Politics and International Organization," Herbert W. Briggs first discusses theories of sovereignty and equality in the light of facts and then analyzes the United Nations Charter, noting certain unfortunate as well as progressive features and hoping for successful collaboration by the three Great Powers responsible for peace. The grim world tragedy from which the United States is confidently expected to emerge evokes no easy optimism, but rather deep anxiety for the difficult tasks ahead. Although there is general agreement on the need for planning, Professor Hansen is convinced that, because free opportunity today means no longer simply the old freedom to start a business or a farm, but much more the new right of "80 to 90 per cent" of the people to have jobs, planning belongs to government at all levels, subject always to "the rule of law"; while Mr. Fuller would leave the job to the initiative, originality, and skill of business men, subject to govern-

ment regulation "but never control." Hansen rejects the possibility of serfdom predicted by Professors Mises and Hayek.—J. VAN DER ZEE.

The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, with the assistance of the National Council for the Social Studies, has undertaken the preparation of a group of pamphlets, to be known as the *Community Study Series*, designed to serve as "resource units" for teachers of social studies in the secondary schools. The first number in the series is *The Structure of Local Government* (Bulletin No. 19, National Council for the Social Studies, pp. 140, $0.50), by Donald G. Bishop and Edith E. Starrett. Part I of the bulletin is a descriptive analysis, with illustrative charts and tables, of the framework of government in counties, towns and townships, municipalities, and special districts. Part II consists of suggested teaching aids and a bibliography. There are occasional factual inaccuracies in the descriptive sections; and the bibliography might have been improved in certain respects, as for instance by citing more recent editions of some of the works included. In general, however, the pamphlet is ably planned and executed, and should serve its purpose well. Teachers of local government in colleges and universities are keenly aware of the dearth of background on the part of their students, and should be grateful to the Maxwell School and the National Council for their efforts to improve teaching in that field at the secondary-school level.—CLYDE F. SNIDER.

In *One Foot on the Soil* (Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama, 1945, pp. xiv, 203), Paul W. Wager presents a most interesting and appropriate appraisal of the federal government's experience with subsistence homesteads at the five projects near Birmingham, Alabama, over a period of seven to nine years. The major purposes of the study were to determine the potentialities and limitations of a pattern of life which combines industrial employment with part-time farming, the extent to which subsistence homesteads enhance the security and improve the economic position of industrial and white-collar workers, whether the social advantages warrant their development as a public enterprise, and if the government is to promote homes of this type, whether they should be built on a community-wide basis. The work is factual and objective. Conclusions are based upon data carefully gathered and presented in some fifty tables throughout the book. Many shortcomings of the projects are pointed out and recommendations made which may well serve as aids to future action in the event that public housing becomes an accepted national policy.—M. CLYDE HUGHES.

Women in Congress (Richmond, Va.: Dietz Press, 1945, pp. 134, $2.00), by Annabel Paxton, is a brief résumé of the careers of the twelve women in

the 78th and 79th Congresses. An introduction is presented dealing with the early struggles for woman suffrage; and the author concludes the book with a directory of women in the 65th to the 79th Congresses, recording their districts and terms. This small volume presents a short account of the women in Congress without an analysis or evaluation of their politics or Congressional contributions.—MARY EARHART DILLON.

FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Simon Liberman's *Building Lenin's Russia* (University of Chicago Press, pp. v, 229, $3.00) is one of the few volumes of memoirs by men who helped effectuate the nationalization of Russia's economy. This shortage is no doubt in part due to the toll taken by the O.G.P.U., and it was to avoid its clutches that Liberman refused to return to Moscow from a trade mission in 1927. A trained engineer and timber expert, he had been employed by large lumber interests in Tsarist Russia and had valuable connections in the international lumber market. On the other hand, he was also a Menshevik with a revolutionary record and personal acquaintance in revolutionary circles dating back beyond the 1905 revolution. Such a combination of talents was very much needed, and Lenin was willing to employ men of this type as specialists to help direct Russian economy. Under supervision of Communist chiefs, Liberman organized the nationalized lumber industry. He planned the North Timber Trust, which later became the model for many other governmental trusts. The volume reveals much of the internal bickering that went on in governing circles, how policies often were at cross purposes, and how the fear of the secret police haunted even the staunchest of old revolutionaries. Liberman insists that the policy of granting concessions to foreign companies was mainly designed to create dissension in the ranks of the capitalist opposition, for then certain groups would be interested in preserving their stake in Russia. The final chapter is a good sympathetic evaluation of the revolution as a whole. Its genuine mass character is stressed, and it is held to be a social democracy within the limits of a political dictatorship! In regard to the latter, he accepts the official version that it is but a temporary phenomenon. Written as a series of episodes, with excellent descriptions of men like Krassin, Rychov, Lenin, and Trotsky interspersed, the book lacks chronological unity. Constant check must be made as to dates in order to fit the events into the over-all picture of the revolution. The material is interestingly presented, and numerous illustrative incidents are recounted, such as the plan, which received serious consideration by the political leaders, of solving Russia's fuel shortage by gathering pine cones. As a whole, the book is very worth-while. Many things, however, are left unsaid. One misses, for example, any discussion of the actual laboring conditions in the lumber camps, which have aroused much adverse criticism.—E. C. HELMREICH.

In *The Peoples of the Soviet Union* (Harcourt, Brace and Co., pp. 229, $3.00), Corliss Lamont, perhaps the best known apologist for the Soviet Union in the United States, has attempted to present a brief popular summary of Soviet policy toward national minorities. The jacket quotation gives clearly the book's objective: "Whatever our views concerning the extent of *political* democracy in the U.S.S.R., we must recognize Soviet Russia's long-established and uncompromising support of ethnic democracy." Even the general reader in search of favorable arguments concerning Soviet minorities policy is likely, however, to be disappointed by Lamont's treatment. With the exception of the final chapter, largely a summary of Soviet enactments and official pronouncements, the body of the book is a rather dry list of population figures, names of ethnic groups, and miscellaneous scraps of information about them. For instance, one may learn in the sole and somewhat unenlightening paragraph on the Bashkir A.S.S.R. (the largest Autonomous Republic) that the inhabitants are a nomadic group with a population of 3,300,000 and that they are fond of drinking fermented mare's milk (p. 37). In several instances, moreover, the author displays the same type of bias he is attempting to combat, as in his ethnocentric comments on Mohammedan marriage customs (pp. 188–189). While it is not fair to tax Lamont with failing to produce a scientific monograph, it is fair to point out that he failed to realize the basic issues involved. Although he mentions briefly the conspicuous failure of Soviet policy among the Volga Germans, his explanation is limited to "fifth column" activities. Furthermore, Lamont's data show that, in many instances, fundamental aspects of the culture of minority groups, such as family mores and religious practices, not to mention economic ones, have been subject to severe onslaught at Communist hands. Thus the Soviet claim that cultural autonomy has been permitted within the framework of a socialist economy has to be stretched considerably to fit the facts. Granting the probable absence of race prejudice, social scientists still lack an answer to the basic question: Does the Soviet method of introducing new political loyalties and, in some cases, an entirely new industrial civilization, involve fewer tensions than other methods?—BARRINGTON MOORE, JR.

In our time of the rising totalitarian creeds, we have to face a good deal of re-writing of history to suit the various party-lines. Such a re-writing of German history has been done by Gerhart Eisler, Albert Norden, and Albert Schreiner in *The Lesson of Germany; A Guide to Her History* (International Publishers, 1945, pp. 222, $2.50). The authors, who were formerly active in the German labor-movement, have approached their task in the spirit of hagiography. Human history has the form of a struggle between the protagonists of good and evil, that is, between progressives and reactionaries, while the big mass of mankind consists of dupes

alternately to be poisoned by the reactionaries and enlightened by the progressives. German history is a sad chapter in the cosmic struggle between the two Manichaean forces. The reactionaries had the better of it until at last they were discomfited; the lesson is that terrible things will happen again in the future if Germany from now on is not run by Communists. The principles of interpretation are furnished by the writings of Marx, Engels, Mehring, and Lenin on German questions; "bourgeois" historians whose works might attract attention to somewhat different aspects of German history are carefully ignored. The authors make no attempt at writing responsible, pragmatic history, but offer a selection of facts, editorialized to suit the principles. Since a political writer usually has a sharp eye for the iniquities of the enemy, the reader will occasionally find a choice tid-bit of Pan-German imperial dreams that hitherto was not known to him. These little items, however, lose much of their value because the authors do not give exact references. On the whole, we may say that to the faithful this type of history will be greatly edifying, while to the scholar it is a farce and to the reviewer a pest.—ERIC VOEGELIN.

After studying the so-called savages in central Africa and the South Sea islands, anthropologists have finally decided that a wealth of materials is still available for them in the western world. Professor Robert H. Lowie's *The German People; A Social Portrait to 1914* (Farrar and Rinehart, pp. 143, $1.75) is written from the "anthropological point of view," which the author defines as "the orientation that comes from trying to see any particular manifestation of culture comparatively, to determine its place among the cultures of humanity as a whole." The emphasis is therefore on social forces and institutions rather than on political ideas and processes. In the introductory chapter, the author discusses the fundamentals of language, culture, and the "German race." It is somewhat strange that a serious anthropologist still calls a sub-chapter "The German Race," even though he may do so for the sole purpose of demolishing the fallacy that such a race exists. Students of Germany who are interested in head measurements, cephalic indices, hair and eye colors of the Germans, will find a mass of valuable data on these questions. The second chapter contains a brief summary of German history in the last two centuries. It has some excellent remarks on German unity and German nationalism. The third chapter, which makes up one-half of the whole book, is by far the most interesting. After a very thin and superficial analysis of the political situation in the Second Reich, the author gives an illuminating account of German education and, finally, of the German class structure. No student of modern Germany should miss these pages pp. (55–102). As Professor Lowie sees it, the "lack of a class of gentlemen" (p. 56) was an important factor that distinguished Germany from

Britain and affected the whole social system. With regard to the German middle classes, Professor Lowie makes the acute comment that their main traits, so different from the middle classes of Britain or the United States, were shaped under the impact of the "tone-setting Junkers" (p. 61). All in all, this is, despite occasional trivialities, a very readable and informative book. The author is intimately familiar with the German language and literature, and he possesses a feeling for German civilization which manages to catch, here and there, the finer points in the German picture. The book suffers from extreme brevity, and it is to be hoped that Professor Lowie will plan his promised volume on contemporary Germany on a much broader scale.—WILLIAM EBENSTEIN.

The fourteen years from 1929 through 1942 covered in Professor Paul T. Ellsworth's *Chile; An Economy in Transition* (Macmillan Co., 1945, pp. 183, $3.00) illustrate, in terms only too reminiscent of our own experiences, the terrifying cycle of depression. The cycle's familiar pattern: loss of export markets, rapid decline in prices, unemployment (in Chile the government-attempted palliative was to encourage placer mining), loss of gold reserves, thirty, fifty, and finally one hundred per cent tariff increases, rigorous exchange control, default in foreign debt service, and depreciation of currency. At the very time when the unemployed descended upon the capital seeking food or jobs on public works, the government drastically cut expenditures. After distress, there ensued public distrust and eventually a change in the government. Considerable attention is devoted to agricultural, industrial, and mining credit institutions and other government corporations whose functions parallel with startling familiarity those of several United States government corporations. The most important is the Chilean Production Corporation (Corporacion de Fomento de la Produción), created in 1939 with broad authorization to make loans and to assist in production and importation enterprises. The directorate of 23 represents a cross-section of government, labor, manufacturers, and engineers. However, Dr. Ellsworth believes that Fomento's investment in the Valdívia steel plant was ill-judged and that, in general, cost considerations tend to be overlooked. The author canvasses the prospects of industrialization in Chile's rather small domestic markets of low per capita income. Lack of skilled technicians, inefficient labor, and doubtful export possibilities, combined with lack of heavy industry, fuel costs, lack of transport, and shortage of local investment capital, make the prospects dim. Postwar reduced markets for copper and nitrates add to the pessimism.—WILLARD F. BARBER.

Books that can genuinely be classed as pioneers in any given field are both infrequent and, by the same token, correspondingly valuable, at

least potentially. That promise of value and usefulness is amply, even admirably, fulfilled in George Wythe's *Industry in Latin America* (Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. ix, 371, $4.00). The number of general studies of any aspect of Latin American economic life is small; this is the first analysis and description of the subject-matter embraced in the title. The title is, indeed, misleading in one respect, and fortunately so. Mr. Wythe's approach is considerably broader than merely a concern with manufacturing in a narrow sense. He deals also with industry as it involves various agricultural processes and extractive activities, with foreign trade, with investment of capital, and with other economic aspects that have an impact on industry defined broadly. It is perhaps inevitable in a book of this sort—and certainly no detriment in this volume—that much attention should be given to the detail of the pattern. The gratifying thing about such a treatment is that the details could be fit so uniformly into a schematic treatment. It is all the more pleasing that the author, along with his very evident intimate knowledge of the detailed situation, has been able to present in his initial chapters so able a perspective of the extent and nature of industrialization in Latin America, the problems of raw materials and fuels, capital and the spirit of enterprise, mechanization, market limitations, and government policies. The bulk of the volume deals with a more detailed treatment of the separate countries. The usefulness of the volume would be considerably increased if it had some maps, graphs, and additional tables; it would also be helpful, for purposes of citation, if the chapters were numbered instead of being merely given titles. These, after all, however, are mechanical and very minor criticisms as compared with the very solid worth of the study that Mr. Wythe has written—a study that leaves all those interested in Latin American economics (which cannot be separated from politics) in his debt.—Russell H. Fitzgibbon.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

In *The Mandates System; Origin-Principles-Application* (League of Nations, 1945, pp. 120, $1.00), distributed by the International Documents Service of the Columbia University Press, the Secretariat of the League of Nations has written an interesting summary of certain aspects of its experiences with the mandate system. The work consists of five chapters, with an annex concerning the "General Conditions which Must Be Fulfilled Before the Mandates Régime Can Be Brought to an End in Respect of a Country Placed Under that Régime." The chapters deal with: (1) "The Origin of the Mandates System"; (2) "The Principles of the Mandatory Régime"; (3) "The Supervision of the Mandatory Administration by the League of Nations"; (4) "The Moral, Social, and Material Welfare of the Natives"; and (5) "The Population of the Mandated

Territories." Particularly valuable are the voluminous statistics on birth-rates, death-rates, population, religious composition, and racial composition of the mandated territories. The Secretariat has made, through its various reports and studies, a valuable contribution to international statistics which in many cases were unavailable or unreliable before its existence. The methods of public administration utilized by the League in its indirect administration of the mandates are also valuable as the basis of administrative control for future international functions. The principal controls used by the Mandates Commission were: (1) questionnaires sent to the Mandatory Powers; (2) annual reports by the Mandatory Powers to the Mandates Commission; (3) petitions sent to the Mandates Commission by the inhabitants of mandated territories through the Mandatory Powers; and (4) observations of the Commission on the reports made by the Mandatory Powers. The publication fails to make, however, a contribution in the very direction where the greatest need and opportunity for knowledge exist. The failures of the mandate system and the causes of those failures are evaded. Although the work states that fortifications were forbidden in the mandates, no mention is made of the failure to prevent Japanese fortifications in Truk, Saipan, and Tinian. Did the Mandates Commission fail in this respect because of lack of on-the-spot investigation? Although the report discusses rather fully social, economic, and moral progress, it significantly leaves out a discussion of any political evolution toward self-government. The report fails also to state whether direct international administration, as carried out in the Saar, would be more beneficial than administration through a mandatory power. Although the report cannot be considered complete or even impartial, it nevertheless is still valuable in regard to several aspects of the mandate system.—JOHN B. MCCONAUGHY.

It is never easy to endow an ideal with life blood, as James P. Warburg has attempted to do in his *Unwritten Treaty* (Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1945, pp. 186, $2.00). Believing that the most important of the Four Freedoms is the first—freedom of information—his book is a plea for an international agreement to promote the free flow of information among all peoples of the world. The author also advocates international agreement to define and outlaw psychological warfare, and to define permissible inter-state propaganda. Mr. Warburg suggests in addition a Department of Information with a secretary of cabinet rank for the United States, to deal with all matters relating to foreign informational services. *Unwritten Treaty* reveals just how difficult it is to give reality to the basic freedom of information. For most newspaper publishers and editors in America, as Mr. Warburg points out, believe that the government should take little or no part in providing news services abroad. What is

even more significant are the great hurdles that must be overcome in reaching agreement with nations like Russia where the press and other information agencies are so closely controlled as to make the unhampered access to news virtually impossible. The popular confusion, particularly in this country, between propaganda and information, also militates against the early achievement of the goal set forth. Perhaps the most interesting part of *Unwritten Treaty* is its discussion of the confusion between propaganda and information, and how such uncertainty served to impede the best prosecution of our psychological warfare during World War II. Mr. Warburg served as deputy director of the Office of War Information until February, 1944, and he writes frankly of the difficulties encountered in that work and of its lack of proper direction. He tantalizes the reader by references to the daring work involved in front-line propaganda, and he gives only the most sketchy interpretation of American, British, and Russian propaganda policies during the war. Although *Unwritten Treaty* contains the texts of the various administrative orders dealing with the OWI and other information agencies established during the war, the book can in no way be considered a final study of their work. It is rather an urgent argument for freer, fuller news and the control of psychological warfare. On this basis, the faults of brief analysis may be overlooked, especially since Mr. Warburg presents the book as an opening statement about a problem which he hopes will be thoroughly debated.—GRANT S. MCCLELLAN.

Among recent publications is a study of *The Internal Administration of an International Secretariat* (Royal Institute of International Affairs, pp. 78, $1.25), by Chester Purves, who was himself an official in the Secretariat of the League of Nations. Since the Secretariat of the U.N. will be organized in the near future, any lessons drawn from League experience must be of the greatest interest not only to those directly responsible for setting up a new body which will function smoothly, but also to all persons interested in the problems of international organization. In discussing personnel, Mr. Purves takes up the special problems of recruitment to and promotion in a small international civil service in which the principle of "national representation" must receive recognition even before merit. Some of the difficulties encountered in the League Secretariat arose from the financial stringency under which it was always forced to operate. Others were attributable to the threat of impermanence which early haunted the entire organization. On a more mechanical level, the requirement of familiarity with the League's two official languages and the duty of recruiting persons from nations with widely varying standards of efficiency and training for government service involved awkward administrative questions which the national government administrator does

not have to face. Among other administrative problems discussed are diplomatic privileges and immunities, the geographical location of the international organization, and the desirability of a unified international civil service including all auxiliary bodies such as the I.L.O. and the Food and Agriculture Organization. It will be interesting to see what the future may have learned from the past.—D. BEATRICE MCCOWN.

Recommendations and Reports: Official Documents, 1942–1944 (Rio Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional, 1945, pp. 161) is the first publication of the Inter-American Juridical Committee, which was created in 1942 by the American Republics for the purpose of suggesting solutions to pressing international legal problems. This first publication contains an introduction, outlining the nature, history, and functions of the Committee, and seven projects completed by it up to December, 1944. These projects deal with the fundamental principles and the codification of international law (Nos. I, II, VI), inter-American agreements concerning the outlawry of war and the pacific settlement of international disputes (Nos. IV, IVa), international postwar problems (No. III), and international organization, including the Dumbarton Oaks proposals (Nos. V, VII). Three of the projects are accompanied by separate reports (Nos. Ia, IVb, VIa). All of these documents are said to be restatements and expressions of the traditions and principles laid down hitherto in numerous inter-American conventions, declarations, and resolutions, or adhered to in the practice of American states. It should be noted, however, that some of the propositions contained in these projects are not generally accepted, nor statements of positive inter-American practices and law. For example, the claim that the law of nations has its principal source, if not basis, in a moral, i.e. Christian, law which applies equally to men and states (cf. No. I, p. 13) is not a statement of either inter-American or general positive international law and practice. Such and similar claims can be explained, however, by the fact that the Committee, in its attempt to solve new problems, also drew upon the ideals contained in inter-American preambles to treaties or in inter-American declarations and resolutions. This recourse to ideals explains also some of the admitted contradictions in the documents, as, for instance, the outlawry of war and the simultaneous recognition of the status of neutrality where a state in fact resorts to war (Cf. No. IV, pp. 53, 66, and see No. IVa, p. 96 f., where the Committee substitutes the principle of collective responsibility for that of neutrality). On the whole, the volume is therefore not only a restatement of inter-American law and practice, but at times also a declaration of the ideal standards of conduct which the American states presumably desire to see realized in the future, both in this continent and throughout the world.—GEORGE MANNER.

World Rubber and Its Regulation (Stanford University Press, pp. x, 265, $3.00), by K. E. Knorr, an addition to the authoritative "Commodity Policy Studies" of Stanford's Food Research Institute, is an excellent analysis of facts and prospects with reference to the social desirability of various forms of rubber control. A fundamental concern is that the world's rubber-production capacity shall be more than double the average prewar absorption. Governmental intervention, domestic or international, may be indicated, whether or not the problem of surplus-production is solved; for the mere balance of production and consumption will not bring about a lasting competitive equilibrium between the plantation and synthetic-rubber industries. As background for consideration of this and other problems, the writer describes rubber production between the two wars, world rubber trade and the uses of rubber, characteristics of the prewar crude-rubber market, and the International Rubber Regulation Agreement of 1934. The synthetic-rubber industry is well considered in Chapter X; final chapters survey postwar problems of consumption, supplies, competition, international regulation, and American policy. The (now defunct) IRRA, the major applied international regulatory measure, was disadvantageous—and probably would be again—from the general social point of view. It interfered with economic processes necessary for consumption of rubber in an expanding world economy. And the author warns, in addition, against international arrangements looking toward the sharing of the world market between natural and synthetic rubbers; the United States ought to consider such a formula only in the event that in a free market synthetics should be capable of asserting themselves heavily for bulk uses. If United States government protection of the synthetic-rubber industry is necessary for military purposes, Dr. Knorr suggests that the guaranty of a variable minimum price per pound and the use (wherever satisfactory) of artificials in the manufacture of equipment offer the least objectionable alternatives. Competently-constructed tables and charts and an annotated bibliography are included.—J. WILLIAM ROBINSON.

In her *Soviet Far Eastern Policy, 1931–1945* (Princeton University Press, 1945, pp. 284, $2.50), Harriet L. Moore gives a brief narrative account emphasizing Russian relations with China and Japan. Her essential purpose has been to provide for American readers a picture of Far Eastern events as viewed by the Soviet government. Much of her material is drawn from Russian official sources. More than one hundred pages are given to documents, treaties, and official Soviet statements. Chapters are devoted to the position of the Soviet Union in the Far East in 1931; the Manchurian crisis of 1931; the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway, 1933–34; frontier and fisheries disputes, 1935–36; developments during the Sino-Japanese war, 1937–39; and finally to events of the war years. Miss

Moore's treatment of the subject is factual and dispassionate, some would say even cold. Perhaps this is desirable in dealing with a contemporary scene where sources are still inadequate and where passions and opinions burn at a high temperature. The disadvantage, of course, is that a narrative so reserved in language, and so limited (by reason of space) in analysis of the problems portrayed, necessarily fails to recreate the atmosphere of rivalry, suspicion, distrust, not to mention the intense international hatreds, so characteristic of the Far Eastern scene in the years under review. The key to much of the story that Miss Moore tells, and also to the position of Russia in the Far East today, is to be found in two points: (1) the absence of Russia from the Washington Conference of 1921–22; and (2) the Soviet view that the report of the Lytton Commission (1932), while genuinely anti-Japanese, was not genuinely pro-Chinese. In a word, historic Soviet policy regarded the United States and the League of Nations powers as "accomplices of the Japanese." Miss Moore does not discuss the implications of this background upon contemporary conflicts of policy in the Far East, but her narrative does provide much of the factual basis on which further analysis must rest.—PAUL H. CLYDE.

In *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union* (International Publishers, 1945, pp. 167, $1.75), the chief wartime addresses of Joseph Stalin have been preserved. Charged with emotion, the language is characterized by a simple, staccato-like, and picturesque style. As such speeches go, therefore, these are not all dull reading. With the noise of battle subsided, the words appear, for the most part, either drab or melodramatic. But against the appropriate backdrop, exhortations of this kind must have been a symbol of achievement and hope to the people. More than this, however, Stalin's political acumen and statesmanship are evident. Several themes prevail throughout. This was a great "patriotic war," a defense of the "motherland" against the "fascist imperialists" by the "whole people." Stalin repeatedly praises, by groups and in detail, the intelligentsia, the collective farmers, the peasantry, and the "great labor exploit" of the working class. Justifiable boasting is done over the fact that the social fabric, the all-important "rear," did not shatter as the Nazis thought it would. The Red Army is, of course, writ large in these statements; an accurate, minutia-laden, and prideful blow by blow description of the four-year progress of Soviet troops is presented. Praise is heaped, too, on the anti-German coalition." Tribute is paid to Great Britain and the United States, and common aims in both war and peace are stressed. Ideological differences among the Big Three are recognized, but these will be resolved in the interests of unity (p. 138). It is noteworthy that scant attention is devoted to the Bolshevik party (pp. 99–100,

121); one has the impression that this was a *national* war and that the Communists were only one element of a strong alloy tempered in the crucible of crisis. These addresses are at least a straw in the wind, or, perhaps, circumstantial evidence. The danger lies in inferring too much or too little from them. Unfortunately, their interpretation will depend greatly on the preconceived ideas which dominate the reader's mind.—R. C. SNYDER.

With elections provoking charges, from both within and without Poland, of interference and intimidation contrary to the terms and spirit of the Yalta Agreement, it is clear that that troubled country will be a disturbing factor in the international scene for some time to come. It is therefore significant that the Division of Economics and History of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace should have inaugurated a series of studies on the postwar political problems of Europe with publication of a small but very useful book by Professors James T. Shotwell and Max M. Laserson entitled *Poland and Russia, 1919–1945* (King's Crown Press, pp. vi, 114, $2.25). The primary problem considered is Poland's disputed Eastern border. As pointed out in the introduction, this is a political question and therefore "less concerned with the substance of the dispute than with the attitudes of the disputants toward each other." In conformity with this approach, the differing views of not only Poland and the Soviet Union, but also White Russia and the Ukraine, are presented with clarity and welcome brevity, with attention to both the past and the present. Adequate consideration is given, as well, to the rôle played by other interested powers, especially from 1919 to 1923 and from August, 1939, to the San Francisco Conference. It might be complained that the information is not new. However, the impartiality and objectivity with which the familiar facts are presented are both new and refreshing. The absence of bias may well be due to the authors' stated conviction that Poland's future security lies, not in any particular boundary line, but (a) in the development of internal strength through economic and social improvements benefiting all its inhabitants and (b) "by the imposition of a lasting peace which will outlaw the resort to violence." This small, concise volume represents a valuable handbook on a problem of vital interest to any student of international relations.—D. BEATRICE MCCOWN.

In his *The Economic Development of the Middle East; An Outline of Planned Reconstruction After the War* (Oxford University Press, 1945, pp. xii, 164, $4.00), Alfred Bonné sketches a twenty-year plan for the Middle East, not including Iran or the states of the Arabian peninsula. Briefly, the basis of his plan is an extension and intensification of agricul-

ture, particularly through irrigation, industrialization, and the financing of both by higher local taxation and loans from an international agency. In the first, the author is essentially on sound ground and his analysis is good. One might like to see the sources for his estimates on cultivable and irrigable land on p. 63, however, and wonder whether overcrowded Europeans could farm in the heat of some of those countries and thus take advantage of the room for 30 million agricultural workers that the author concludes will result from land development. Specific instances of industrialization presented are too few to make one share the author's optimism concerning that field. The one great mineral resource of the area, of course, is oil. But oil wells spread little cash in the neighborhood, and it is admitted that in Iraq, the greatest oil producing state included in the study, the number employed "in modern industry hardly exceeds one-half per cent of the total earners" (p. 38). In a special chapter, the author outlines the unusual Palestine development more fully, but it is regrettable, particularly since he is director of the Economic Research Institute of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and should be able to get the information if at all available, that he does not indicate the extent of dependence, if any, of that economy upon contributions from abroad. In another special chapter, he discusses a customs union for the area, concluding that such would not promote the general welfare, as the needs and degrees of advancement of the various countries are too diverse.—WILBUR W. WHITE.

What the South Americans Think of Us (McBride and Co., 1946, pp. 400, $3.00) is a symposium by four well-known writers in the Latin American field. It purports to give the answer to the question implied in the title. Carleton Beals deals with Ecuador, Perú, and Bolivia; Bryce Oliver discusses the attitudes of the peoples of Brazil and Uruguay; Herschel Brickell takes Venezuela and Colombia; and Samuel Guy Inman interprets Argentinian and Chilean attitudes. Undoubtedly the book does a better job of explaining the South Americans' political, social, and economic organization and mores than in answering the question, "What do the South Americans think of us?" When the authors finally get around to discussing the "question before the house," the answer is the usual one, i.e., the South Americans do not like us at all. Furthermore, they do not like us for the usually stated, now time-worn, trinity of reasons; we will not learn their language, our manners are boorish, and above all our government, when dealing with them, is utterly stupid. Mr. Brickell (Venezuela and Colombia) is the least inclined to make use of this technique in solving the problem of the "Colossus of the North" vis-à-vis South Americans. This book will give one a very good idea of recent political and economic developments in the countries with which it deals, and the interpretations

of conditions in these countries are very well made. However, he who seeks only the answer to "What do South Americans think of us and why?" must look elsewhere; for the answer given in *What the South Americans Think of Us* is not new nor any more convincing.—WILLIAM MARION GIBSON.

Editor Ronald Hilton has now brought out the second published part (numbered I) of the third edition of *Who's Who in Latin America* (Stanford University Press and A. N. Marquis Co., 1945, pp. xiv, 130, $2.50). This portion deals with Mexico; Part II (published first) included biographies from Central America and Panama: five other parts are promised to complete the Latin American coverage with 8,000 biographies. Part I seems more cohesive than Part II, perhaps because it treats a single country. There is still the serious defect that eminent temporary or accidental residents are included along with nationals. Diego Martínez Barrio, the Spanish republican leader, and various *norteamericano* business men would seem to have little place in a Mexican Who's Who. Nevertheless, the completed "biographical dictionary" will make a useful, even if expensive, tool.—RUSSELL H. FITZGIBBON.

In his *Tomorrow's Trade* (Twentieth Century Fund, 1945, pp. 156, $1.00), Stuart Chase makes clear the fact that neither politics nor economics can be written about in a vacuum. In its quest for scholarship, the United States has at times sought to atomize research into the social sciences. Details have been stressed at times with little respect to relationships between economics and political science, psychology and political science, sociology and political science, or history and political science. The trend now, however, seems to be the healthier one of stressing relationships. Certainly no political scientist can determine the future political complexion of England without taking into account the necessity of English exports if England is to survive. An economist must consider the results of political pressures before he can predict whether a country will abide by or desert the gold standard. Stuart Chase believes that the prime requisite for a stable world order is full production and consumption in the United States because the United States is the greatest world producer and consumer. In case of an America depression, political pressures will be generated which will raise tariffs and halt the flow of American investment funds to the rest of the world. In order to attain this full production, the United States must emphasize consumption rather than production. This book explains international trade in such terms that all should be able to understand it.—JOHN B. MCCONAUGHY.

Forthright, factual, informative are adjectives that fittingly describe the dominant traits of General Sir Osborne Mance's *International River*

and Canal Transport (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1945, pp. viii, 115, $1.00). Into this brief book, General Mance, assisted by J. E. Wheeler, has packed a large amount of legal, statistical, and operational data relating to the international river and canal régimes of the world; and this material is properly concentrated on the Rhine and Danube systems. His account reveals his sound understanding of the economic and political aspects of traffic on international rivers and its relations to such other interests as electric power and afforestation. Every attempt at maintaining an international waterways régime has been marred, he shows with a touch of disgust, by vested interests, power politics, and nervous efforts to protect national sovereignty from even slight infringements. Future régimes, he demonstrates, must be inter-regional or continental schemes closely related to other methods of transport. These régimes, he states emphatically, must exercise sovereign powers to do their jobs well; their policy-forming and technical agencies must be separated to simplify administration and to insulate the professional bureau from politics. These are the conclusions of this careful study, which political scientists and historians may read profitably.—GARLAND DOWNUM.

Two pamphlets recently issued provide an interesting study of the evolution of certain aspects of the foreign policy of the United States in the last quarter-century. The first, *Nations United for Peace* (Syracuse University Press, 1945, pp. 59, $0.25), edited by Donald G. Bishop, is a collection of excerpts from the writings and speeches of Charles Evans Hughes during the period 1922–29, reflecting the wisdom and foresight of that eminent statesman. Especially valuable are his opinions of the nature and rôle of international law and of the fundamental principles of international coöperation which today constitute the basic assumptions underlying the United Nations Organization. His comments on the difficulties of formulating foreign policy in this country are, unfortunately, as valid today as two decades ago. Numerous footnotes relate the observations of Mr. Hughes to subsequent events. The second pamphlet, *The United Nations in the Making: Basic Documents* (World Peace Foundation, 1945, pp. 130, $0.25), presents the evolution of the structure of the United Nations, in which the United States has played a leading rôle. Here is the concrete expression of many of Mr. Hughes' aspirations. All essential documents, from the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations to the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, are included, along with reports of the important big power conferences and excerpts from the instruments establishing such specialized agencies as UNRRA, the International Monetary Fund, etc. Also included are the Covenant of the League of Nations and the "Philadelphia Charter" of the International Labor Organization.—ALFRED P. FERNBACH.

The second edition of *Modern World Politics* (Crowell, 1945, pp. xii, 852, $3.75), by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi and associates, is better than the first. Although Dr. Kalijarvi has written fully one-third of the book, thirteen other persons have contributed one or more chapters each. The book has been thoroughly revised. Several of the original chapters have been omitted and an equal number of new ones added. There are four parts. The first deals with the fundamentals of international relations, and includes chapters on international law and organizations for international government. The second analyzes the techniques and instruments of power politics. These are found to exist in considerable number and variety, and include the press, diplomacy, secret organizations, psychological warfare, treachery, and planning. The third part treats the problems of the various regions into which the world is divided, and the fourth poses the question, "peace in our time?" A weakness of the book lies in the difficulty of integrating the work of several authors into a unified whole, although in this respect improvement is shown over the earlier edition. The wealth of material commends itself to wide use as a text in introductory courses.—RALPH A. NOREM.

POLITICAL THEORY AND MISCELLANEOUS

The reader's reaction to Saul D. Alinsky's *Reveille for Radicals* (University of Chicago Press, 1946, pp. 228, $2.50) may be one of full agreement or of intense irritation, but one thing is certain—he will react. For Alinsky loves people and democracy in a spirit of lofty idealism, and he writes with passionate conviction. He believes that democracy is now in a state of serious crisis, and that its greatest weakness lies in the fact that the people do not now directly participate in the formulation of their own goals and in the solution of their community problems. If it is to survive, democracy must be a dynamic process in which the masses of people actually participate, and only the Radical can achieve this end. Alinsky assumes that the Conservative is so completely doomed to utter futility that he does not even bother to denounce him. But he does take a great deal of space to damn the Liberal. Liberals do not act, they merely talk; they profess to have lofty ideals, but always with reservations; they pursue the chimera of objectivity to the point of stultification; above all, they fear power. In contrast, "the Radical is that unique person who actually believes what he says"; he is so completely identified with mankind "that he personally shares the pain, the injustices, and the sufferings of all his fellow-men"; he not only asks for change, but, unlike the Liberal, he also fights for it, and it is a hard, dirty, bruising fight. Unlike most Radicals, Alinsky finds little hope for "peaceful revolution" in the American labor movement as it is now constituted, for he argues that it is fatally committed to capitalism and all its iniquities and that it has a bad record in

the field of race relations. His remedy is the formation of "people's organizations" in each community, and his practical suggestions are based on his own experience in organizing the Back-of-the-Yards People's Organization in the stockyards section of Chicago. The nub of the plan seems to lie in bringing together in some institutional fashion the "natural leaders" of the community, a natural leader being one who commands a following, whether he is an important business man or a bartender. These leaders of the community will learn how to get along together, once they know each other, and will inspire the community to take active steps in solving its pressing social and political problems. Alinsky has some shrewd advice to offer to organizers, and he does not shrink from resorting to rather Machiavellian tactics. This is an honest book, and it should be widely read, even though its excited analysis of Liberalism ignores the basic qualities of its nature, history, procedures, and accomplishments.—DAVID FELLMAN.

The attack on individualistic conceptions of morals and politics, so prominent in the recent literature of social thought, is sustained and reenforced in Elton Mayo's *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1945, pp. xvii, 140, $2.50). Directing his attention primarily to relationships between management and workers, Professor Mayo cites industrial research studies to show that, in the absence of adequate social organization, "incentive" wages and appeals to individual economic self-interest do not operate to encourage production. Industrial efficiency and maximum production are the result primarily of solidarity and a feeling of oneness among workers—of the sense of belonging to a significant social group. "If one observes either industrial workers or university students with sufficient care and continuity, one finds that the proportionate number actuated by motives of *self-interest logically elaborated* is exceedingly small. They have relapsed upon self-interest when social association has failed them" (p. 43). In politics, as might be expected, the author criticizes doctrines which stem from Hobbesian conceptions of the social order. Political order is not an imposition from without on anti-social men, but rather the outgrowth of inherent coöperative tendencies. There is nothing new in the general argument of this book, although Mayo seems at times to maintain the contrary. But the concrete illustrations taken from recent industrial research serve very well to point up Aristotle's ancient observation that man is a political animal. —MULFORD Q. SIBLEY.

It seems inevitable that, after "the battle flags are furl'd," the stream of chauvinistic propaganda should continue to flow for some time. David Abrahamsen's *Men, Mind, and Power* (Columbia University Press, 1945,

pp. 155, $2.00) constitutes such an ill-fated attempt to depict the beaten enemy nation as Satan incarnate. One can only deplore that a scientist from Norway, a nation so admirably free from jingoistic leanings, should have nothing better to do than to expound the old tale of the "wicked German" in pseudo-scientific language. Stripped of the medley of vulgarized Freudian, Adlerian, and Jungian terminology, his narrative boils down to the unique discovery that not only the Nazis but *the Germans* are maladjusted. This ailment is supposed to have been typical of Germany since the days when "life in the dark forests affected the thinking of the German tribes." A single chapter in any of the works of Fromm and Heiden, Cantril and Silone, contributes more to the understanding of Nazi psychology than the author's entire badly written and poorly organized book. His lack of logic and of sound psychological insight goes hand in hand with an amazing absence of general education. Among the numerous "boners" that stand out gaily against a bleak background of boring platitudes, only the following can be quoted: Hitler's birthplace is transferred to "a small village" "near the Slovak border;" the German language is characterized as "a language full of so many harsh sounds" "calling forth rude thoughts" and "producing cruel deeds"; "homosexual expressions" are credited with "having also been at work in giving the Germans their prevalent character traits." Sapienti sat!—Ossip K. Flechtheim.

It is typical of wartime interest in postwar prospects that the Pabst Brewing Company celebrated its hundredth birthday by sponsoring an essay contest on postwar employment. Of the 36,000 entries, some 200 have been edited by Lyle Fitch and Horace Taylor, of Columbia University, in a volume entitled *Planning for Jobs* (Blakiston Co., 1945, pp. xxii, 463, $3.75). The arrangement of the material does not reflect any clearly recognizable pattern of contemporary economic thinking. A streak of Keynesianism has been allowed to creep in, but in one place as "maintaining aggregate expenditures," and twenty pages later as "controlling total expenditures." Some of the individual contributions are of a high order, the search for technical means of stabilizing economic expansion being admirably illustrated with essays by Alvin Hansen, Frank D. Graham, and Homer Hoyt; but contributions such as these are so widely scattered amid so much heterogeneous matter that they have to be re-thought in the framework less of this book than of economic theory before their significance can become fully clear to the inexpert student. What gives this book its value lies not so much in the realm of theory as in its reflection of the spirit of practical inventiveness with which Americans are approaching contemporary social problems. Its folk-economics calls attention, for example, to the influence of low-interest instalment

buying on consumption, the facilitating of minimum standards by a stamp plan for commodity distribution, and the stabilizing effect of guaranteed markets; and its desire for work-spreading may indicate the prevalence not so much of an economic fallacy as of an understanding that full production may not bring full employment. The need for governmental action is taken for granted, except in a few essays in which it is ingeniously or ingenuously by-passed; but the organizational means for obtaining the needed governmental action is discussed only in one brief but suggestive contribution by Leon Keyserling.—W. HARDY WICKWAR.

The plan for *The Training and Employment of Disabled Persons* (International Labour Office, 1945, pp. vi, 302, $1.50) was drawn by the International Employment Committee, in June, 1945, to provide a general survey of public policies (private agencies omitted) adopted or planned to aid occupational establishment of disabled persons. While detailed data are available in some countries, other data are vague and fragmentary, largely because of war conditions. The eleven chapters cover the general scope of the problem, general administrative organization, medical and vocational services, identification and registration, vocational guidance, training and retraining, special employment measures, sheltered employment, placement, special conditions and comparative job performance, and a summary. The appendix has valuable additional data. The aim generally is to rehabilitate the disabled for jobs with able-bodied workers; and as a rule disabled benefits apply only to veterans. This report is especially valuable for those interested in rehabilitation work.—WILLIAM L. BRADSHAW.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF POLITICAL INTEREST

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

MULFORD Q. SIBLEY

AND

MARJORIE H. SIBLEY

University of Illinois

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC LAW

Books and Pamphlets

American Maritime Council. Foreign trade and shipping. Pp. 317. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1945.

Anderson, William, and *Gaus, John M.* Research in public administration. Pp. 221. Chicago: Pub. Admin. Service. 1945.

Bain, Joe S. The economics of the Pacific coast petroleum industry, II, Price behavior and competition. Pp. 453. Berkeley (Calif.): Univ. of Calif. Press. 1945.

Blakey, Roy G., and *Blakey, Gladys C.* Sales taxes and other excises. Pp. 216. Chicago: Pub. Admin. Service. 1945.

Borsodi, Ralph. Inflation is coming! a practical postwar plan. Pp. 67. Suffern (N. Y.): Bayard Lane, Inc. 1945.

Bulman, David, ed. Molders of opinion. Pp. 175. Milwaukee: Bruce. 1945

Chandler, Alfred N. Land title origins; a tale of force and fraud. Pp. 564. N. Y.: Robt. Schalkenbach Found. 1945.

Clark, W. H. Farms and farmers; the story of American agriculture. Pp. 366. Boston: L. C. Page. 1945.

Davidson, Clinton. Your cost of postwar tax proposals; estimates of the postwar federal budget and tax rates necessary to balance it. Pp. 76. Searcy (Ark.): Harding College. 1945.

Duffy, John F., jr. State administrative machinery for the conciliation and mediation of labor disputes. [mimeographed]. Pp. 48. Berkeley: Bur. of Pub. Administration, Univ. of Cal. 1945.

Fanning, L. M., ed. Our oil resources. Pp. 339. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1945.

Ferguson, D. G., and *Others.* What will inflation and devaluation mean to you? Pp. 144. Cambridge (Mass.): Amer. Inst. for Econ. Research. 1945.

Fisher, Allan George B. Economic progress and social security. Pp. 373. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1946.

Gardiner, G. L. When foremen and steward bargain. Pp. 194. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1945.

Graham, Frank. Al Smith, American; an informal biography. Pp. 251. N. Y.: Putnam. 1945.

Hansen, Alvin H., and *Others.* The United States after war. Pp. 180. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press. 1945.

Hartman, Grover L. Militarism for America. Pp. 42. Wallingford (Pa.): Pendle Hill. 1945.

Henry, Jack. What price crime? Pp. 112. N. Y.: Hutchinson & Co. 1945.

Henson, Allen L. Red galluses (a story of Georgia politics). Pp. 269. Boston: House of Edinboro Pub. 1945.

Hicks, John R., and *Hart, G. H.* The social framework of the American economy; an introduction to economics. Pp. 261. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. Press. 1945.

Kilgo, John W. Campaigning in Dixie, with some reflection on two-party government. Pp. 232. Cynthiana (Ky.): Hobson Bk. Press. 1945.

Kingsley, Philip. The Chicago *Tribune;* its first hundred years; v. 2, 1865–1880. Pp. 372. Chicago: Chicago Tribune. 1945.

Kvaraceus, William C. Juvenile delinquency and the school. Pp. 340. Yonkers: World Book. 1945.

Marshall, James. Sante Fé, the railroad that built an empire. Pp. 481. N. Y.: Random. 1945.

Powell, Adam Clayton, jr. Marching blacks; an interpretive history of the rise of the black common man. Pp. 218. N. Y.: Dial. 1945.

Reynolds, L. G., and *Killingsworth, C. C.* Trade union publications; the official journals, convention proceedings, and constitutions of international unions and federations, 1850–1941; vs. 2 & 3. Pp. 543, 460. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1945.

Sawyer, Elmer W. Insurance as interstate commerce. Pp. 180. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1945.

Silverberg, L. G., ed. The Wagner act; after ten years. Pp. 126. Washington: Bur. of Natl. Affairs. 1945.

Smith, Harold D. The management of your government. Pp. 179. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1945.

Stene, Edwin O. Railroad commission to corporate commission; a study in Kansas administrative history. Pp. 108. Lawrence: Univ. of Kansas Press. 1945.

Swisher, Carl B. The growth of constitutional power in the United States. Pp. 271. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1946.

Todd, Lewis Paul. Wartime relations of the federal government and the public schools, 1917–1918. Pp. 251. N. Y.: Bur. of Pubns., Teachers College. 1945.

Wagner, Paul W. One foot on the soil; a study of subsistence homesteads in Alabama. Pp. 230. University (Ala.): Bur. of Pub. Admin., Univ. of Ala. 1945.

Wernette, John P. Financing full employment. Pp. 136. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard. 1945.

Williamson, S. T., and *Harris, H. H.* Trends in collective bargaining; report and recommendation by the Labor Committee. Pp. 263. N. Y.: Twentieth Cent. Fund. 1945.

Worley, Lillian. Alabama's people. Pp. 56. University (Ala.): Bur. of Pub. Admin., Univ. of Ala. 1945.

Wright, David M. Business and the radical indictment. Pp. 59. York (Pa.): Maple Press. 1945.

Articles

Administrative Law. Mississippi supreme court decisions on administrative law. *T. C. Kimbrough.* Miss. Law Jour. Oct., 1945.

———. The supreme court and administrative regulation, 1941–1944. *C. Herman Pritchett.* Iowa Law Rev. Nov., 1945.

Agriculture. An evaluation of the wartime farm price-support programs. *Gideon Hadary.* Jour. of Bus. of the Univ. of Chic. Oct., 1945.

———. Farmers' coöperatives as competitors. *Howard W. Selby.* Harvard Bus. Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Agricultural chattel mortgage law of 1945. *A. J. Flattery.* N. Y. State Bar Assoc. Bull. Dec., 1945.

Army and Navy. The judgmental review in general court-martial proceedings. *W. M. Connor.* Va. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The nation's military security. *M. W. Curzon.* What is national defense? *K. B. Platt.* Scientific Mo. Jan., 1946.

———. Our armed forces; merger or coördination? *George Fielding Eliot.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

———. Preparation for defense. *R. B. Heilman.* So. Atlan. Quar. Jan., 1946.

Aviation. Surface carrier participation in air transportation. *J. A. Tomlinson.* Georgetown Law Jour. Nov., 1945.

Bankruptcies. The bankruptcy administration reform bill. *Chauncey W. Reed.* Jour. of the Am. Judicature Soc. Dec., 1945.

Bar. The unauthorized practice of law. *John Clark Fitzgerald.* Conn. Bar Jour. Oct., 1945.

Business. When-issued securities trading in law and practice. *Louis Loss* and *Raymond Vernon.* Yale Law Jour. Sept., 1945.

———. Statistical quality control in war production. *Holbrook Working.* Jour. of Am. Statistical Assoc. Dec., 1945.

———. The supreme court and business planning. *Arthur A. Ballantine.* Small business; a community problem. *Charles C. Abbott.* Harvard Bus. Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Antitrust during national emergencies—executive immunity. *Wallace Hawkins* and *Charles B. Wallace.* Tex. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. American productivity, I & II. *Charles R. Walker.* Fortune. Jan., Feb., 1946.

———. My job—as I see it. *Tom Clark.* Nation's Business. Jan., 1945.

———. Small business, I love you. *C. Hartley Grattan.* Harper's. Feb., 1946.

———. Enough facts to choke a horse. *Oliver Hoyem.* Nation's Bus. Feb., 1946.

Censorship. Judicial review of orders by the postmaster-general revoking second class mailing privileges. *J. H. Hull.* Georgetown Law Jour. Nov., 1945.

———. How the censors rigged the news. *Fletcher Pratt.* Harper's. Feb., 1946.

Civil Liberties. The still unfinished case of Harry Bridges. *Max Radin.* Soc. Service Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The Screws case; federal protection of Negro rights. *Julius Cohen.* Columbia Law Rev. Jan., 1946.

Congress. Apportionment of representatives in congress on the basis of special populations. *Morris B. Ullman.* Jour. of Am. Statistical Assoc. Dec., 1945.

Conscription. Consequences of conscription. *Purnell Benson.* Enquiry. Fall, 1945.

———. One war is enough; a veteran talks back. *Edgar L. Jones.* Atlantic. Feb., 1946.

———. Conscription and the West Point mind. *Arthur E. Morgan.* Am. Mercury. Feb., 1946.

Conservation. Oklahoma's amazing soil program. *E. T. Peterson.* Southwest Rev. Summer, 1945.

———. The recent natural gas decisions and state control of production. *Maurice H. Merrill, V. H. Kulp,* and *J. G. Hervey.* Tex. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

Constitutional Law. Robert H. Jackson; the middle ground. *James A. Nielson.* La. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

Coöperatives. The challenge of coöperatives. *Harry C. Wolfe.* Pub. Util. Jan. 17, 1946.

Crime and Criminal Law. Comments on the attitude of the legal profession towards psychiatry. *E. J. Lukas.* Lawyers Guild Rev. Sept.-Oct., 1945.

———. Insanity as a defense in criminal cases. *E. H. Green.* Miss. Law Jour. Oct., 1945.

———. The federal rules of criminal procedure. *L. B. Orfield.* Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Sufficiency of the charge in an indictment in Louisiana. *A. E. Ralston, Jr.* Tulane Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

Demobilization. Demobilization, then and now. *Ben B. Seligman.* Labor and Nation. Oct., 1945.

———. Disability benefits for discharged soldiers—law, regulation, and procedure. *Leo E. Fitzgibbons.* Iowa Law Rev. Nov., 1945.

———. A better break for veterans. *Hillier Krieghbaum.* Survey Graphic. Jan., 1946.

———. Veterans want to be citizens. *N. A. Pelcovits.* Harper's. Feb., 1946.

Education. What is academic freedom? *George Bond.* Southwest Rev. Summer, 1945.

———. Industrial relations and the curriculum. *Phillips Bradley.* Soc. Research Nov., 1945.

———. The myth of educational equality. *J. K. Norton.* Am. Mercury. Jan., 1946.

———. The question of federal funds for public schools; pro and con. *Symposium.* Cong. Digest. Feb., 1946.

———. The responsibility of the colleges for government. *A. T. Vanderbilt.* General Magazine and Hist. Chronicle.

Elections. Constitutionality of party-circle bills. *Kenneth C. Sears.* Univ. of Chic. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Loopholes in election laws. *Alexander Wiley.* Nation's Bus. Feb., 1946.

Family. Treatment of juvenile delinquents. *Hyman S. Lippman.* Soc. Service Rev. Sept., 1945.

———. International aspects of the marriage laws of the United States. *T. U. Kalijarvi.* Ill. Law Rev. Nov.–Dec., 1945.

———. "Prospective" application of changes in community property control—rule of property or constitutional necessity? *Barbara N. Armstrong.* Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The administration of guardianship by a local probate court. *Mary Stanton.* Soc. Service Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Expenditures and savings of city families in 1944. *Dorothy S. Brady.* Mo. Labor Rev. Jan., 1946.

Foreign Policy. The United States and imperial preference. *L. S. Amery.* Commonwealth & Empire Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. America and the Commonwealth. *Editors.* Round Table. Dec., 1945.

———. Atomic energy and American policy. *Editors.* Int. Conciliation. Dec., 1945.

———. Drum and mask diplomacy. *Junius B. Wood.* Nation's Bus. Jan., 1946.

———. The future of Anglo-American relations. *Aylmer Vallance.* Pol. Quar. Jan.–Mar., 1945.

———. Where are we headed? *Henry S. Commager.* Atlantic. Feb., 1946.

———. The U. S. and world affairs. *Eugene Lyons.* We have a foreign policy. *Junius B. Wood.* Nation's Bus. Feb., 1946.

Government Contracts. Case history of a terminated contract. *Robert G. Allyn.* Accounting Rev. Oct., 1945.

———. Government liability for breach of contract. *James A. Cosgrove.* Conn. Bar Jour. Oct., 1945.

———. In the wake of speedy termination settlements. *K. I. Parsons* and *W. J. Blum.* Univ. of Chic. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

Health. Why bother about public health? *John Chapman.* Southwest Rev. Summer, 1945.

———. Health and medical care of school children; legislation in Illinois. *Mary Zakrobsky.* Soc. Service Rev. Sept., 1945.

———. Prepaid group medical care. *T. S. Harding.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Oct., 1945.

———. The medical uses of atomic energy. *Robley D. Evans.* Atlantic. Jan., 1946.

———. Putting teeth into health. *M. M. Davis.* Survey Graphic. Jan., 1946.

———. Compulsory health insurance developments. *Carl W. Strow.* Sociol. and Soc. Research. Jan.–Feb., 1946.

Highways. Instructions in regard to the speed of motor trucks; a study in statutory interpretation. *Frank Murray.* Ky. Law Jour. Jan., 1946.

Housing. Filtering down and the elimination of substandard housing. *Richard U. Ratcliff.* Jour. of Land & Pub. Util. Econ. Nov., 1945.

———. Crisis in housing. *Harry C. Bates.* Am. Federationist. Jan., 1946.

Indians. A crusade for Indian reform, 1922–1934. *R. C. Downes.* Miss. Valley Hist. Rev. Dec., 1945.

Judiciary. The selection of judges. *L. L. Bomberger.* Ind. Law Jour. Oct., 1945.

———. Court organization in Michigan. *S. H. Clink.* Jurisdiction and responsibility of juvenile courts. *A. E. Moore.* Mich. State Bar Jour. Nov., 1945.

———. Social technology and the courts in modern times. *T. S. Harding.* The grand jury as an agency of social control. *E. M. Lemert.* Am. Sociol. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The divided supreme court, 1944–1945. *C. Herman Pritchett.* Mich. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Participation of judges and laymen in improving the administration of justice. *Bolitha J. Laws.* Va. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Juridical legislation. *George W. Hardy, Jr.* La. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The citizen as juror. *J. H. Flanigan.* The need of professional selection of judges. *R. N. Wilkin.* Qualifications of minor court judges. *E. R. Sutherland.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Soc. Dec., 1945.

Labor. The full employment bill. *Nat'l Committee on Postwar Planning, Nat'l Lawyers Guild.* Lawyers Guild Rev. Sept.–Oct., 1945.

———. Reorganization of the department of labor. *Solomon Barkin.* Philip Murray's Industrial Council plan. *John Brophy.* Truman ain't Roosevelt. *Harold J. Ruttenberg.* Labor management production committees. *Dorothea de Schweinitz.* NLRA on the chopping block. *Independent Economist.* Labor and Nation. Oct., 1945.

———. Prerogatives of labor. *Lester Thornton.* Opinion and Comment. Nov. 18, 1945.

———. Trade union government; a formal analysis. *Joseph Shister.* Quar. Jour. of Econ. Nov., 1945.

———. Wage rates and "relative economy and fitness" in the transportation industry. *Dan H. Mater.* Jour. of Bus. of the Univ. of Chic. Oct., 1945.

———. Retroactivity of national war labor board awards. *E. L. Gordon.* Columbia Law Rev. Nov., 1945.

———. The employer's right of free speech in industry under the national labor relations act. *Walter L. Daykin.* Ill. Law Rev. Nov.–Dec., 1945.

———. The proposed fair employment practice act; facts and fallacies. *A. Bruce Hunt.* The rôle of the Wagner act in preventing industrial strife. *Earle K. Shawe.* Va. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Strikes and the public interest. *Sumner H. Slichter.* Yale Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Understanding union administration. *Philip Taft.* Harvard Bus. Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Maintaining high-level production and employment: *Fritz M. Marx*, ed. A practical approach. *James E. Murray.* Technical requirements. *Gerhard Colm.* Party government and employment policy. *E. E. Schattschneider.* Organizing government staff services for full employment. *John J. Corson.* Private enterprise and full employment. *Ralph E. Flanders.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Strengthen the Wagner act. *W. M. Leiserson.* Union job relations. *James Higgins.* The wages-prices-profits issue. *B. B. Seligman.* Prices need not be raised. *Chester Bowles.* Proposed: $30 a week minimum pay. *Robert H. Jackson.* Labor looks at unemployment insurance. *Editors.* Labor men in government agencies. *John Gibson.* Labor and Nation. Dec., 1945.

———. Labor's deeper reckoning. *Peter A. Carmichael.* Antioch Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Winter of industry's discontent. *Beulah Amidon.* Survey Graphic. Jan., 1946.

———. Union label outlook. *I. M. Ornburn.* Am. Federationist. Jan., 1946.

———. Truman's labor fact-finding plan; pro and con. *Symposium.* Cong. Digest. Jan., 1946.

———. Slavery for labor? *Joseph F. Padway.* Behind the USES transfer veto. *N. H. Cruikshank.* The postal workers' plight. *W. C. Doherty.* Am. Federationist. Jan., 1946.

———. Is full employment feasible? *George B. Mangold.* Sociol. and Soc. Research. Jan.–Feb., 1946.

———. Ethnic behavior in industry; sponsorship and rejection in a New England factory. *Orvis Collins.* Comment on "Discrimination against older workers in industry." *Stanley Lebergott.* Am. Jour. of Sociol. Jan., 1946.

———. How a modern strike is run. *Carlisle Bargeron.* Talking turkey with the unions. *James O. Rice.* Nation's Bus. Jan., 1946.

———. A proposal for industrial peace. *Kurt Solmssen.* Harper's. Feb., 1946.

Legislation. Some quantitative aspects of legislation in Kentucky. *Rodman Sullivan.* Ky. Law Jour. Jan., 1946.

OPA. The possible significance of OPA price panels. *E. E. Sparlin.* Soc. Forces. Dec., 1945.

Patents and Copyrights. Some stray thoughts of a federal judge on our patent system and its operation. *Evan A. Evans.* Wis. Law Rev. July, 1945.

———. Patents, antitrust law, and antitrust judgments through Hartford-Empire. *Philip Marcus.* Georgetown Law Jour. Nov., 1945.

Personalities. "The man" Bilbo. *J. C. Rich.* Labor and Nation. Oct., 1945.

———. The Virgin Islands and its judicial system. *H. E. Moore.* Nat. Bar Jour. Dec., 1945.

———. President Truman's hot potatoes. *C. P. Trussell.* Nation's Bus. Jan., 1946.

———. Monsignor John A. Ryan; an historical appreciation. *A. I. Abell.* Rev. of Politics. Jan., 1946.

———. Mr. Justice Roberts—a sketch. *F. L. Clark.* Penna. Bar Assoc. Quar. Jan., 1946.

———. Stassen; young man going somewhere. *John Gunther.* Harper's. Jan., 1946.

———. Everyman in the white house. *Kenneth Crawford.* Am. Mercury. Feb., 1946.

Personnel. Is veteran preference the answer? *Fritz Mosher.* Federal night pay policies. *Ismar Baruch.* Personnel directors' conferences on training. *Richard O. Niehoff.* OPA's staff information program. *Constance Roach.* The suggestion system reconverts—and learns. *J. F. Mulcahy.* Person. Admin. Jan., 1946.

———. Institutional employee maintenance policies in the states. *Morton Friedman.* State Govt. Jan., 1946.

———. Personnel goals for the federal service. *A. S. Flemming.* Evaluating military experience for civilian employment. *W. G. Coleman.* Some notes on oral examinations. *Muriel Morse.* Employee relations in the federal service—present and future. *Otto S. Beyer.* Personnel administration in a liquidating agency. *William Brody.* Pub. Person. Rev. Jan., 1946.

Planning. Planning for the education of planners; a commentary. *John M. Gaus.* Jour. of Land & Pub. Util. Econ. Nov., 1945.

———. Conference procedure for postwar planning. *F. Stuart Chapin.* Soc. Forces. Dec., 1945.

Press. The changing pattern of the newspaper publishing industry. *C. V. Kinter.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Oct., 1945.

Prisons. Case-work needs in our penal institutions. *Nathan Berman.* Soc. Service Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. A note on direct action. *James Peck.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

Public Administration. Mr. Truman reorganizes. *John Fischer.* Harper's. Jan., 1946.

Public Debt. Crucial problem of the federal debt. *Aubrey G. Lanston.* Harvard Bus. Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. How dangerous is the public debt? *Leo Barnes.* Atlantic. Feb., 1946.

Public Opinion. What congressmen and administrators think of the polls. *Martin Kriesberg.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Fall, 1945.

———. The use of interviewer rapport as a method of detecting differences between "public" and "private" opinion. *Frederick Williams* and *Hadley Cantril.* Jour. of Soc. Psych. Nov., 1945.

Public Utilities. Washington utility outlook for 1946. *Francis X. Welch.* The carrier phone arrives—via REA. *W. B. Whichard.* Pub. Util. Jan. 3, 1946.

———. Outlook of electric utilities under inflation. *E. R. Abrams.* Pub. Util. Jan. 17, 1946.

Race Relations. East Indians in the United States. *Gurdial Singh.* Sociol. & Soc. Research. Jan.–Feb., 1946.

Rationing. Wartime rationing and governmental organization. *Paul M. O'Leary.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Dec., 1945.

Social Security and Welfare. The Puritan background of the New England poor laws. *Elizabeth Wisner.* Soc. Service Rev. Sept., 1945.

———. Distribution of family allowance benefits. *Harry Grossman* and *Robert H. Cole.* Soc. Service Rev. Sept., 1945.

———. Responsibility of children in the Massachusetts old age assistance program. *A. A. Linford.* Soc. Service Rev. Sept., 1945.

———. Appellate procedure in workmen's compensation cases, II. *George W. Angerstein.* Chic.-Kent Law Rev. Sept., 1945.

———. Judgment day for the private welfare agency. *Mrs. Eugene Meyer.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Fall, 1945.

———. The old-age reserve fund is not "illusory." *George B. Robinson.* Quar. Jour. of Econ. Nov., 1945.

———. Social welfare legislation of 1945. *H. L. Russell.* Soc. Service Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The growing problem of the aged. *J. J. Griffin.* Soc. Service Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Social work becomes a profession. *R. P. Lane.* Am. Mercury. Jan., 1946.

———. State workmen's compensation legislation in 1945. *Alfred Acee.* Mo. Labor Rev. Jan., 1946.

Taxes. Income taxes and capital investment. *L. B. McIntire.* Accounting Rev. Oct., 1945.

———. Federal-state tax coördination. *Rollin Browne.* The federal tax inducements to western hemisphere trade. *L. A. Tepper* and *Joseph Lotterman.* Federal control of the state taxation of airlines. *Martin Saxe.* Cornell Law Quar. Nov., 1945.

———. Constitutionality of federal estate taxation of community property. *S. G. Winstead.* Tex. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The revenue act of 1945. *W. C. Butscher.* An advocacy and a critique of "a tax program for a solvent America." *Mark E. Richardson.* Jour. of Accountancy. Jan., 1946.

———. Present deductions for postwar projects. *George D. Brabson.* Taxes. Jan., 1946.

———. Indiana law and legislation, 1940–1945: taxation. *Allison Dunham.* Indiana Law Jour. Jan., 1946.

———. Recent developments in income, gift, and estate tax law. *Lee C. Bradley, Jr.* Ala. Lawyer. Jan., 1946.

Transportation. Freight-rate parity? Not yet! *Ed Gossett.* Southwest Rev. Summer, 1945.

TVA Regional research; the experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority. *L. L. Durisch.* Pub. Affairs. Summer, 1945.

———. TVA—an American invention. *David Lilienthal.* Atlantic. Jan., 1946.

World War II. America at war; the triumph of the machine. *Hanson W. Baldwin.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Books and Pamphlets

Anderson, Evelyn. Hammer or anvil; the story of the German working-class movement. Pp. 207. London: V. Gollancz. 1945.

Bagalà, Gaetano. Fascismo e corporativismo, essenza e definizione, lineamenti di filosofia politica; 2nd. ed. Pp. 346. Bologna: Cantelli. 1942.

Baker, Mrs. Nina Brown. Lenin. Pp. 257. N. Y.: Vanguard, 1945.

Balazard, Henri. De la notion de juste prix dans la doctrine et dans la législation nationales-socialistes. Pp. 76. Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence. 1943.

Barna, T. Profits during and after the war. London: Fabian Society. Gollancz. 1945.

Bonilla Marin, Gabriel. Teoría del seguro social. Pp. 258. Mexico: Talleres tipográficos de la Compañía editora nacional. 1945.

Bonneau, Henri. La distinction de la loi et du règlement sous l'empire des actes constitutionnels de 1940–1942. Pp. 263. Paris: A. Pedone. 1944.

Bourdillon, Anne F. C., ed. Voluntary social services; their place in the modern state. Pp. 322. London: Methuen & Co. 1945.

Bramstedt, E. K. Dictatorship and political police. Pp. 275. London: Paul. 1945.

Burdeau, Georges. Cours de droit constitutionnel. Pp. 272. Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence. 1943.

Cole, Margaret. General election—1945 and after. London: Fabian Society, Gollancz. 1945.

Colombia. Constitución política de la república de Colombia y nuevo estatuto del trabajo. Pp. 95. Bogotá: Editorial Pax. 1945.

Cortney, Philip. The economic and political consequences of Lord Keynes' theories; Great Britain's fear of the gold standard. Pp. 32. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Bkstore. 1945.

Cripps, Sir Stafford. Towards a Christian democracy. Pp. 90. London: Allen and Unwin. 1945.

Cruz Lopez, Raymundo de la. El seguro social; la Ley mexicana de 1943 y los contratos colectivos del trabajo. Pp. 74. Mexico: Universidad nacional autónoma de Mexico. 1945.

Ebeling, H. German youth movement. Pp. 40. London: Muller. 1945.

Engelmann, Susanne C. German education and re-education. Pp. 147. N. Y.: Internatl. Univ. Press. 1945.

Flores Villar, Elena. El estudio psicofisiológico en los delincuentes. Pp. 31. Mexico: Universidad nacional de Mexico. 1944.

Gandhi, Mohandas K. Cent per cent swadeshi; or The economics of village industries. Pp. 108. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Pub. Co. 1945.

Gooch, George P. Courts and cabinets. Pp. 401. N. Y.: Knopf. 1945.

Gould, Randall. China in the sun. Pp. 414. Garden City (N. Y.): Doubleday. 1945.

Gypsin, Arnold. Arbeitsrecht. Pp. 192. Zurich (Switz.): Polygraphischer verlag. 1943.

Harley, J. H. Towards a free Europe. Pp. 183. London: Allen and Unwin. 1945.

Henry, Albert. Administration et fonctionnaires, essai de doctrine administrative. Pp. 416. Bruxelles: R. Stoops. 1944.

Hyamson, A. M. Palestine: a policy. Pp. 214. London: Methuen. 1945.

Jackson, T. A., ed. Essays on the French revolution; trans. from Russian. Pp. 211. London: Lawrence and Wishart. 1945.

Jaffe, Philip. New frontiers in Asia; a challenge to the West. Pp. 381. N. Y.: Knopf. 1945.

Kulkarni, V. B. The future of Indian states. Pp. 114. Bombay: Thacker & Co. 1944.

Latty, E. R., ed. Aviation transport. Pp. 628. (Law & Contemp. Problems, Vol. XI, no. 3.) Durham (N. C.): School of Law, Duke Univ. 1945.

Lipson, E. Europe, 1914–1939; 2nd ed. Pp. 795. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1945.

Loewenstein, Prince Hubertus zu. The Germans in history. Pp. 596. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1945.

Longrigg, S. H. Short history of Eritrea. Pp. 196. London: Clarendon. 1945.

Luzich, Fausto. Gobernantes del futuro. Pp. 122. Buenos Aires: F. Vallardi. 1944.

Mao, Tse Tung. The fight for a new China. Pp. 80. N. Y.: New Century. 1945.

Matos Escobedo, Rafael. La crisis política y jurídica del federalismo. Pp. 236. Xalapa-Enríquez: Editorial Veracruzana. 1944.

Miñano-García, Max H. Some educational problems in Peru. Pp. 70. Austin (Tex.): Univ. of Tex. Press. 1945.

Munro, Katherine. France, yesterday and to-day: short survey. Pp. 107. London: Roy. Inst. of Internatl. Affairs. 1945.

Mustard, Harry S. Government in public health. Pp. 240. London: Oxford. 1945.

National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations. How conservatives have helped British people. Pp. 84. London: Conservative Party. 1945.

Palande, Manohar R. Introduction to Indian administration. Pp. 393. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. Press. 1944.

Pan Wei-Tung. The Chinese constitution. Pp. 327. Washington: Cath. Univ. of Amer. Press. 1945.

Parti Communiste. La politique nationale du parti communiste français, dix aus de lutte pour l'intérêt supérieur du pays. Pp. 55. Alger: Éditions Liberté." 1943.

Pearson, F. A., and *Harper, F. A.* The world's hunger. Pp. 90. Ithaca (N. Y.): Cornell Univ. Press. 1945.

Price, Willard De Mille. Key to Japan. Pp. 317. N. Y.: John Day. 1946.

Radzinawiecz, L., and *Turner, J. W. C.*, eds. The modern approach to crime. Pp. 520. (English studies in criminal science, v. 4.) N. Y.: Macmillan. 1945.

Revusky, Abraham. Jews in Palestine, new and rev. ed. Pp. 382. N. Y.: Vanguard. 1945.

Rousselet, Marcel. Histoire de la justice. Pp. 126. Paris: Presses universitaires de France. 1943.

Sadeque, Abdus. The Indian constitutional tangle and the way out. Pp. 62. Calcutta: W. Zaman. 1941.

Sarasin, Georges. Praxis der interkantonalen doppelbesteuerung, mit beispielsammlung. Pp. 98. Zurich: Schulthess & Co. 1945.

Schlesinger, Rudolf. Federalism in central and eastern Europe. Pp. 533. London: Kegan Paul. 1945.

Schuyler, R. L. The fall of the old colonial system; a study in British free trade, 1770–1870. Pp. 352. N. Y.: Oxford. 1945.

Schweinburg, Eric F. Law training in continental Europe; its principles and public function. Pp. 129. N. Y.: Russell Sage Found. 1945.

Trebbi, Ermanno. La legislazione per i lavori pubblici degli enti ausiliari dello stato. Pp. 350. Como: C. Nani. 1943.

Wigglesworth, Frederick. The money of democracy. Pp. 127. London: St. George Book Co. 1945.

Wythe, George. Industry in Latin America. Pp. 379. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1945.

Articles

Argentina. What goes on in Argentina? *Felix J. Weil.* Antioch Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. What if Peron wins? *Scott Seegers.* Inter-American. Feb., 1946.

Australia. Australia; first steps of the Chifly government. *Editors.* Round Table. Dec., 1946.

———. Australian social insurance legislation, 1944–45. *Editors.* Mo. Labor Rev. Jan., 1946.

Austria. Austria after the elections. *S. Wolfe.* Contemp. Rev. Jan., 1946.

Belgium. The Flemish problem. *H. H. B. Mosberg.* Fortnightly. Nov., 1945.

———. The constitutional crisis in Belgium. *Henri Rolin.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Brazil. What happened in Brazil? *Frederico C. del Villar.* Inter-American. Feb., 1946.

British Commonwealth. The British commonwealth and empire today. *Malcolm Macdonald.* World Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Bulgaria. Bulgarian aspects. *G. C. Logio.* Contemp. Rev. Jan., 1946.

Burma. Burma—an experiment in self-government. *J. Russell Andrus.* For. Pol. Rep. Dec. 15, 1945.

Canada. Research for full employment. *W. F. Ryan.* The war and the Japanese in Canada. *F. E. La Violette.* Pub. Affairs. Summer, 1945.

———. Canadian law of civil aviation. *B. C. Richardson.* Jour. of Comp. Legislation and Internatl. Law. Nov., 1945.

———. Canada; financial stresses in a federal system. *Editors.* Round Table. Dec., 1946.

———. Canada's trade commissioners. *G. R. Heasman.* Quar. Rev. of Commerce. Winter, 1945–46.

———. Education for an enduring peace. *John A. Irving.* Queen's Quar. Winter, 1945–1946.

———. Japanese Canadians. *Edith Fowke.* Blueprint for the red man. *Hazel Robinson.* Farmers must raise their sights. *D. Suter.* Nothing was too good for the veterans. *Samuel Roddan.* Can. Forum. Jan., 1946.

———. Canadian economy and the war. *J. M.-E.* World Today. Jan., 1946.

———. What the CCF needs. *Andrew Brewin.* The good old excess profits tax. *Horace King.* Agitator—de luxe model. *Ross MacMurray.* Can. Forum. Feb., 1946.

China. Social policy in China. *T. K. Djang.* Int. Labour Rev. Nov., 1945.

———. The Chinese central police college. *Kwang-Shee Chu.* Jour. of Crim. Law & Criminol. Nov.–Dec., 1945.

———. Tension in China. *S. D. Bailey.* Contemp. Rev. Jan., 1946.

Czechoslovakia. Kamil Krofta, 1876–1945. *S. H. Thomson.* Jour. of Cent. Eur. Affairs. Oct., 1945.

———. The German and Hungarian minorities in Czechoslovakia. *A. G. Bettany.* World Affairs. Jan., 1945.

———. I saw Czechoslovakia. *Nora Waln.* Atlantic. Feb., 1946.

Denmark. Interim solution in Denmark. *A. J. Fischer.* Contemp. Rev. Dec., 1945.

France. The decline of the French communists. *Gelo and Andrea.* Politics. Dec., 1945.

———. The right of taxation in France during the religious wars. *Philip Dur.* Jour. of Mod. Hist. Dec., 1945.

———. French criminal procedure. *J. Pitcairn Hogg.* Can. Bar Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The fourth republic. *Editors.* Round Table. Dec., 1945.

———. Election in France. *John Pollock.* Contemp. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Politics in France. *Gallus.* Nat. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The new régime in France. *Charles A. Micaud.* Yale Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Change in France. *D. W. Brogan.* Va. Quar. Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Pensées sur l'organisation de l'après-guerre. *W. F. Russell.* Le régime représentatif français—grandeur et décadence. *Marcel Sibert.* Mirabeau et la constitution de 1791. *Rene de Messieres.* Les partis de la révolution française. *Mirkine-Guetzévitch.* Au temps de l'occupation allemande, II. *Henri de Montfort.* La République Française. Jan., 1946.

———. Retraining of France ex-servicemen and displaced persons. *Editors.* Mo. Labor Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. The presidents of the French republic. *W. W. Crotch.* Quar. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. The new French government. *Gallus.* Nat. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. The future of representative democracy in France. *Louis R. Franck.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

———. De la faute et du risque a propos des dommages causes par les travaux publiques. *René Latournerie.* Contribution a l'étude de la légitimité des gouvernenents de fait. *Maurice Duvcrger.* Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique. Jan.–Mar., 1946.

———. France, salesman of democracy. *Andre Visson.* Am. Mercury. Feb., 1946.

General and Comparative. The future of labor. *Marion Hedges*, Pub. Affairs. Summer, 1945.

———. The international validity of divorces. *G. C. Cheshire.* Law Quar. Rev. Oct., 1945.

———. The schism between the Greek and Roman church and its significance. *Peter Charanis.* Jour. of Cent. Eur. Affairs. Oct., 1945.

———. British magistrates in east and west Africa. *A. N. Doorly.* Jour. of Comp. Legislation and Internatl. Law. Nov., 1945.

———. The maintenance of full employment after the transition period; the United States and the United Kingdom. *M. Kalecki.* Int. Labour Rev. Nov., 1945.

———. Problems of European reconstruction. *Nehemiah Robinson.* Quar. Jour. of Econ. Nov., 1945.

———. European labor in transition. *Adolph Sturmthal.* Labor and Nation. Dec., 1945.

———. America's Christmas gift to Europe: starvation. *Dwight Macdonald.* Politics. Dec., 1945.

———. Conflict patterns in the near east. *W. J. Cahnman.* Chicago Jewish Forum. Winter, 1945.

———. America and Britain, 1939–1946. *D. W. Brogan.* Yale Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Employment situation in foreign countries, I. *Faith M. Williams, Margaret H. Schoenfeld,* and *Others.* Mo. Labor Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. "Give us more American education." *Nels Anderson.* Survey Graphic. Jan., 1946.

———. Why Europe tries socialism. *L. G. Dillon.* Nation's Bus. Feb., 1946.

———. Europe after World War II. *Erik N. Kuehnelt-Leddihn.* Cath. World. Feb., 1946.

Germany. The impact of nazi law. *Friedrich Roetter.* Wis. Law Rev., July, 1945.

———. "Trial" by nazi court-martial. *R. H. Mason.* So. African Law Jour. Nov., 1945.

———. The crisis of German Protestantism. *Carl Mayer.* Soc. Research. Nov., 1945.

———. Germany revisited. *Dr. W. Schütz.* Contemp. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The record of the German left, II. *Paul F. Nemenyi.* Current Hist. Dec., 1945.

———. Germany and the Germans. *Thomas Mann.* Yale Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Labor conditions in Germany since occupation. *Editors.* Mo. Labor Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. Trade unionism in Germany. *Editors.* Labour. Jan., 1946.

———. Germany after twelve years. *Veit Valentin.* Contemp. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. Germany's deformed conscience. *William Harlan Hale.* Harper's. Jan., 1946.

———. American Influences in the Making of the Constitution of the German Republic. *Fritz-Konrad Kruger.* Amer.-German Rev. Feb., 1946.

Great Britain. British election as seen through American eyes. *Mark Starr.* Labor and Nation. Oct., 1945.

———. Double taxation in regard to death duties. *R. F. Bailey.* Jour. of Comp. Legislation and Internatl. Law. Nov., 1945.

———. A note on export problems. *George Schuster.* Fortnightly. Nov., 1945.

———. Some recent books on the British labor movement. *Charles L. Mowat.* Jour. of Mod. Hist. Dec., 1945.

———. The budget and the bank bill. *F. W. Hirst.* Contemp. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. A young Tory's remonstrance. *Edward Poynder.* Nat. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Conservatives or chameleons? *J. G. Fairfax.* Nat. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Anarchy in demobilization. *J. S. Hecht.* Nat. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Maintaining high-level production and employment: British plans. *W. Hardy Wickwar.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The education act at work. *W. J. Pincombe.* Liberal. Dec., 1945.

———. Some recent books on the British labor movement. *Charles L. Mowat.* Jour of Mod. Hist. Dec., 1945.

———. Britain after battle. *C. H. J. Snider.* Parliament and the powers of the cabinet. *J. E. Hodgetts.* Queen's Quarterly. Winter, 1945–1946.

———. Staff welfare in government departments. *D. Smyth.* The training of civil servants. *W. A. Ross.* National insurance and national assistance local offices. *F. Marcus Arman.* Pub. Admin. Winter, 1945–46.

———. Can Britain's labor government succeed? *L. Wallis.* Crime and punishment in England of the eighteenth century. *O. Sherwin.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1946.

———. British-American coöperation. *Redvers Opie.* N. J. Municipalities. Jan., 1946.

———. The foreign secretaryships of Mr. Eden. *A. L. Kennedy.* Post-mortem on voting at the election. *Mass-Observation.* The course of conservative politics. *Viscount Hinchingbrooke.* Quar. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. Ernest Bevin. *Michael Williams.* World Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Greece. Agrarian reform in Greece. *K. A. Doukas.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Oct., 1945.

Hungary. The Hungarian revolution. *Ilona Polanyi.* World Affairs. Jan., 1946.

India. The next approach to India's political question. *William P. Barton.* Fortnightly. Nov., 1945.

———. Hindu law today. *George Rankin.* Jour. of Comp. Legislation and Internatl. Law. Nov., 1945.

———. The emigration and status of Indians in the British empire. *S. Chandrasekhar.* Soc. Forces. Dec., 1945.

———. Eve of the Indian elections; the prospects in. *Frank Brown.* Commonwealth & Empire Rev. Dec., 1945.

Italy. Aftermath in Italy. *R. J. M. Goold-Adams.* Quar. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. After the fascist hoax. *Max Ascoli.* Free World. Feb., 1946.

Jamaica. Experiment in Jamaica. *W. B. Faherty.* Inter-American. Feb., 1946.

Japan. The Japanese mentality. *Alvin Johnson.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Oct., 1945.

———. Japanese opinion surveys; the special need and the special difficulties. *A. L. Knutson.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Fall, 1945.

Jugoslavia. The Yugoslav political situation. *P. S.* World Today. Jan., 1946.

Korea. The land of morning calm. *Barbara Leighton.* Free World. Feb., 1946.

Mexico. Marriages by proxy in Mexico. *W. B. Stern.* So. Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Protestantism in Mexico. *J. A. Magner.* Cath. World. Jan., 1946.

Netherlands Indies. Revolt in the Netherlands Indies. *Sidney B. Fay.* Current Hist. Dec., 1945.

Norway. Legislation on reëmployment rights in Norway. Data from *Walter Galenson.* Mo. Labor Rev. Jan., 1946.

Palestine. The Palestine reality. *Jabir Shibli.* Cath. World. Jan., 1946.

———. The Palestine problem. *Israel Cohen.* Contemp. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. The future of Palestine. *S. V. Pearson.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1946.

———. Is Palestine fair to Islam? *John E. Uhler.* Cath. World. Feb., 1946.

Salvador. Organization in El Salvador. *T. Lynn Smith.* Rural Sociol. Dec., 1945.

South Africa. The advocate's oath. *Editors.* An anomaly of the law of libel. *C. E. M.* So. African Law Jour. Nov., 1945.

Soviet Union. A psychological study of Stalin. *Charles Prince.* Jour. of Soc. Psych. Nov., 1945.

———. The Russian intelligentsia. *Bertram Wolfe.* Antioch Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The consistency of Stalin. *David J. Dallin.* Am. Mercury. Jan., 1946.

———. A note on soviet place-names. *Bertram D. Wolfe.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

———. Some current illusions regarding the U.S.S.R. *Floyd A. Cave.* Social Science. Jan., 1946.

———. Russia and freedom. *G. Fedotov.* Rev. of Politics. Jan., 1946.

———. Russia's in a tight spot, too. *Peter F. Drucker.* Harper's. Jan., 1946.

———. Les prochaines élections en U.R.S.S. *Andre Pierre.* La République Française. Jan., 1946.

Spain. Franco still rules. *Anna L. Lingelbach.* Current Hist. Dec., 1945.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Books and Pamphlets

Ciano, Count Galeazzo. The Ciano diaries, 1939–1943; ed. by Hugh Gibson. Pp. 615. Garden City: Doubleday. 1945.

Confederación de trabajadores de América latina. Segundo congreso general de la Conferación de trabajadores de la América latina. Pp. 159. Cali (Colombia). 1944.

Curtis, Lionel. World war: its cause and cure., 2nd ed. Pp. 306. London: Oxford. 1945.

Dean, Vera Micheles. The four cornerstones of peace. Pp. 291. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1946.

Dennen, Leon. Trouble zone; brewing point of world war III? Pp. 184. Chicago: Ziff-Davis. 1945.

Edwards, C. D., and *Others.* A cartel policy for the United Nations. Pp.130. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1945.

Garlin, Sender. Enemies of the peace: profile of the 'Hate-Russia' gang. Pp. 48. N.Y.: New Century. 1945.

Halm, George N. International monetary coöperation. Pp. 366. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N.C. Press. 1945.

Henderson, Sir Neville. Failure of a mission; new ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1945.

Heymann, Hans. We can do business with Russia. Pp. 284. Chicago: Ziff-Davis. 1945.

Hursley, Frank, and *Hursley, Doris.* Atomic bombs. Pp. 72. Syracuse (N.Y.): Syracuse Univ. Press. 1945.

Johnston, F. E., ed. World order; its intellectual and cultural foundations; a series of addresses. Pp. 256. (Inst. for Religious Studies Pubns.) N.Y.: Harper. 1945.

Laserson, Max M. Russia and the western world; the place of the Soviet Union in the comity of nations. Pp. 285. N.Y.: Macmillan. 1945.

Lasswell, Harold D. World politics faces economics, with special reference to the future relations of the United States and Russia. Pp. 108. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1945.

Maulnier, Thierry. La France, la guerre et la paix. Pp. 180. Montreal: Les Éditions Variétés. 1946.

Morgenthau, Hans Joachim, ed. Peace, security, and the United Nations. Pp. 133. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1945.

Nearing, Scott. The tragedy of empire. Pp. 168. N.Y.: Island Press. 1945.

Passant, E. J. The problem of Austria. Pp. 40. N.Y.: Oxford. 1945.

Sayers, Michael and *Kahn, Albert E.* The great conspiracy; the secret war against Soviet Russia. Pp. 442. Boston: Little Brown. 1945.

Scelle, Georges. Manuel élémentaire de droit international public (avec les textes essentiels). Pp. 57. Paris: Domat-Montchrestien. 1943.

Stark, Freya Madeline. The Arab island; the Middle East, 1939–1943. Pp. 259. N.Y.: Knopf. 1945.

Tralnin, Aron Naumovich. Hitlerite responsibility under criminal law; ed. & trans. Pp. 108. London, N.Y.: Hutchinson & Co. 1945.

Verlinden, Carlos. Pour une fédération des nations libres. Pp. 191. Liége: Editions Desoer. 1944.

Walton, D. D. The gentlemen are winning the peace; letters exchanged with W. B. Ziff concerning "The gentlemen talk of peace." Pp. 92. N.Y.: William-Frederick Press. 1945.

Wang Tieh-Yai. The status of aliens and foreign enterprise in China. Pp. 69. N.Y.: Inst. of Pacific Relations. 1945.

West, Ranyard. Psychology and world order. Pp. 128. London: Penguin. 1945.

Whyte, Sir Frederick. Rise and fall of Japan. Pp. 59. London: Roy. Inst. of Internatl. Affairs. 1945.

Wolff, Martin. Private international law. Pp. 682. N.Y.: Oxford. 1945.

Articles

Atomic Energy. Atomic energy in international and constitutional law. *Committee on Internat'l Law and Relations, Nat'l Lawyers Guild.* Lawyers Guild Rev. Sept.–Oct., 1945.

———. Atomic bombs in international society. *E. D. Thomas.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Oct., 1945.

———. Military consequences of atomic energy. *Joseph Rosenfarb.* Antioch Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Anarchy and the atom. *Violet Bonham Carter.* Liberal. Dec., 1945.

———. International control of atomic power. *Horst Mendershausen.* Labor and Nation. Dec., 1945.

———. Sociology and the atom. *William F. Ogburn.* Am. Jour. of Sociol. Jan., 1946.

Austria. The southern boundaries of Austria. *Erik R. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn.* Jour. of Cent. Eur. Affairs. Oct., 1945.

Canada. Canada's new stature. *Lionel Gelber.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Colonies. Colonies and world peace. *Paul Blanchard.* Am. Mercury. Jan., 1946.

Communications. International radio. *Noel Newsome.* Pol. Quar. Jan.–Mar., 1946.

———. "The international language." *Francisco Azorin.* Am. Esperantist. Jan.–Feb., 1946.

Eire. Unneutral neutral Eire. *R. M. Amylie.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Food. The postwar food position. *R. H.* World Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Germany. Germany; the British zone. *Norman Bentwich,* Fortnightly. Nov., 1945.

———. The allies in Berlin. *George Bilainkin.* Contemp. Rev. Dec., 1945.

Great Britain. Britain's imperial preference. *Alice B. McGinty.* Current Hist. Dec., 1945.

———. How best to get on with Russia. *Francis Lindley.* Nat. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Revolt in Java. *Ronald Pearce.* Nat. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Britain and the Persian question. *Jules Menken.* Nat. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. The labour party and foreign policy. *John Martin.* Contemp. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. Britain must be generous too. *Chapman Revercomb.* Nation's Bus. Jan., 1946.

———. Britain and western Europe. *R. H. S. Crossman.* Britain in the atomic age. *Leonard Woolf.* Britain and Russia. *Kingsley Martin.* Pol. Quar. Jan.–Mar., 1946.

International Law. The distinction between combatant and non-combatant in the law of war. *Lester Nurick.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Oct., 1945.

———. Recognition of governments, I. *H. Lauterpacht.* Columbia Law Rev. Nov., 1945.

———. International law; an inventory. *E. D. Dickinson.* Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Recognition of governments, II. *H. Lauterpacht.* Prize law reconsidered. *A. W. Knauth.* Columbia Law Rev. Jan., 1946.

International Trade and Finance. Cartels and the future of world-trade. *Wendell Berge.* Pub. Affairs. Summer, 1945.

———. Postwar exchange-rate parities. *M. E. Garnsey.* Quar. Jour. of Econ. Nov., 1945.

———. Financing the international bank. *Henry C. Wallich.* Harvard Bus. Rev. Winter, 1946.

———. Cartels; realism or escapism? *G. A. Briefs.* Rev. of Politics. Jan., 1946.

———. International trade. *Hugh Gaitskell.* Pol. Quar. Jan.–Mar., 1946.

Iran. The trouble isn't over in Iran. *W. H. Hindle.* Harper's. Feb., 1946.

Italy. The northeastern frontier of Italy. *René Albrecht-Carrié* Jour. of Cent. Eur. Affairs. Oct., 1945.

———. The future of Italy's colonies. *Vernon McKay.* For. Pol. Rev. Jan. 1, 1946.

———. The Italo-Jugoslav frontier. *Gaetano Salvemini.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Japan. Japan and western Europe. *F. Oppenheimer.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Oct., 1945.

Peace Planning. The strategy of territorial decisions. *Isaiah Bowman.* The risks of a big-power peace. *Herbert V. Evatt.* How to deal with Japan. *Hu Lin.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

———. The question of Trieste. *A. E. Moodie.* World Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Refugees. Mass expulsions. *R. H. M. Worsley.* Nineteenth Cent. Dec., 1945.

Regions. Eastern Europe and western diplomats. *Elizabeth Wiskemann.* Fortnightly. Nov., 1945.

———. The future of American propaganda in Latin America. *Mrs. R. Hart Phillips.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Fall, 1945.

———. Frontiers and mass migrations in eastern central Europe. *Hans Rothfels.* Rev. of Politics. Jan., 1946.

———. French difficulties in the middle east. *Charles-André Julien.* The fuel crisis in Europe. *Karl Brandt.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

———. Central-eastern Europe and America's future. *Joseph S. Roucek.* Some persistent errors and illusions about central and eastern Europe. *George Washkovich.* Certain misconceptions in regard to the eastern Mediterranean and Greece. *N. G. Marvis.* Baltic States—the Belgium of eastern Europe. *Alfred Bilmanis.* Some common misconceptions about the Baltic States. *J. Kajeckas.* Social Science. Jan., 1946.

———. The Levant dispute; the Arab case. *Edward Atiyah.* World Affairs. Jan., 1946.

Soviet Union. Russia and the United States in world economy. *G. C. Guins.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1946.

———. Russia and the United States. *J. L. Hopkins.* So. Atlan. Quar. Jan., 1946.

———. The Russians are tough. *Edwin W. Hullinger.* Nation's Bus. Feb., 1946.

UNRRA. The financial experience of UNRRA. *T. A. Sumberg.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Oct., 1945.

———. Why UNRRA has failed. *John Perry.* Harper's. Jan., 1946.

———. UNRRA and its task. *J. A. Keyser* and *L. C. Marsh.* World Affairs. Jan., 1946.

———. International mutual aid; the task of UNRRA. *E.R.O.* World Today, Jan., 1946.

War Crimes. War criminals and the defense of act of state in international law. *Alexander N. Sack.* Lawyers Guild Rev. Sept.–Oct., 1945.

——— War trials and German re-education. *Bruno Bettelheim.* Politics. Dec., 1945.

———. The international military tribunal at Nuernberg. *John Huber.* The outstanding social document of the year. *Robert H. Jackson.* Labor and Nation. Dec., 1945.

———. Crime and punishment. Nuernberg. *Nora Waln.* Atlantic. Jan., 1946.

———. Legal basis of the Nuernberg trials. *Murray C. Bernays.* Survey Graphic. Jan., 1946.

———. Morality at Nuernberg. *Georg Mann.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

World Organization. The children of the United Nations.—UNRRA'S responsibility for social welfare. *Martha Branscombe.* Soc. Service Rev. Sept., 1945.

———. Universities committee on post-war international problems: summaries of reports of coöperating groups. *Editors.* Int. Conciliation. Oct., 1945.

———. Regional federal states for world peace. *Quintin M. Sanger.* Soc. Forces. Oct., 1945.

———. Intervention; individual and collective. *C. G. Fenwick.* Power politics and international organization. *H. W. Briggs.* International agencies in the western hemisphere. *R. D. Masters.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Oct., 1945.

———. Wanted: public opinion. *Owen J. Roberts.* Public Opin. Quar. Fall, 1945.

———. Experience and techniques in international administration. The Pan American union in the field of international administration. *Josef L. Kunz.* The development of an international civil service for the administration of relief and rehabilitation of war devastated areas. *Joseph P. Harris.* Iowa Law Rev. Nov., 1945.

———. Veto and collaboration. *Rudolph Schlesinger.* Education and cultural coöperation. *J. Mackay-Mure.* Fortnightly. Nov., 1945.

———. Memorandum to the United Nations concerning the rôle of social science in the service of peace and security. *G. H. Grosser.* Soc. Forces. Dec., 1945.

———. World peace in the atomic age. *K. G. Younger.* The mandate system and San Francisco. *Norman Bentwich.* Commonwealth and Empire Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The United Nations security council. *A. P. Fernbach.* Va Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. United Nations' Organization—its mechanism and possibilities. *V. M. Townsend, Jr.* Nat. Bar. Jour. Dec., 1945.

———. Pillars of the united nations—international economic and social agencies. *Blair Bolles.* For. Pol. Rep. Dec. 1, 1945.

———. A summary analysis of the charter of the United Nations. *Ray Forrester.* Tulane Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. UNESCO. *R. C. Wallace.* Queen's Quar. Winter, 1945–1946.

———. The Saar plebiscite of 1935. *Helmut Hirsch.* So. Atlan. Quar. Jan., 1946.

———. The super-powers at San Francisco. *W. T. R. Fox.* Rev. of Politics. Jan., 1946.

———. The atomic bomb and world government. *Sumner Welles.* Atlantic. Jan., 1946.

———. Dans l'attente d'une nouvelle organisation internationale. *Georges Scelle.* La République Française. Jan., 1946.

———. The San Francisco conference—its structure and documentation. *Nelle Signor.* Special Libraries. Jan., 1946.

———. The nomination and election of judges of the world court. *W. L. Ransom.* The science of law as substitute for war. *Robert N. Wilkin.* Am. Bar Assoc. Jour. Jan., 1946.

———: UNESCO by *Archibald MacLeish.* Free World. Feb., 1946.

World War II. Weapons and wars. *V. W. Germains.* Contemp. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. New tactics in naval warfare. *Bernard Brodie.* Foreign Affairs. Jan., 1946.

———. Stanley military internment camp: Hong Kong. *Lancelot Forster.* Contemp. Rev. Jan., 1946.

———. The German generals, I. *B. H. Liddell Hart.* Harper's. Jan., 1946.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Books and Pamphlets

Benis, George W. Intergovernmental coördination of public works programs in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Pp. 24. Los Angeles: Haynes Foundation. 1945.

Binkley, Robert W., Jr. County government in California [mimeographed]. Pp. 69. Berkeley: Univ. of Cal. 1945.

Bishop, Donald G. The structure of local government. Pp. 140. Washington: Natl. Council for Social Studies. 1945.

Grunstein, H. B. The rise of the Jewish community in New York, 1654–1860. Pp. 658. Philadelphia: Jewish Pubn. Soc. of Amer. 1945.

Jackson, W. Eric. Local government in England and Wales. Pp. 214. London: Penguin. 1945.

Justement, Louis. New cities for old; city building in terms of space, time, and money. Pp. 237. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1945.

Rocco, Armando M. Finanzas municipales de la provincia de Buenos Aires. Pp. 277. Buenos Aires: "El Ateneo." 1945.

Rose, Henry T. The councillor's handbook; a short guide to local government. Pp. 201. London: J. Pitman & Sons. 1945.

Shelley, A. N. C. and *Beattie, D. J.* Local government law and administration in England and Wales: Supplement, 1945. Pp. 350. London: Butterworth. 1945.

Webb, W. D., and *Others.* Cities in Society. Pp. 30. Austin: Univ. of Tex. Press. 1945.

Articles

Aviation. The airport—keystone of air transportation. *Allen C. Perkinson.* Va. Mun. Rev. Dec., 1945.

City Manager. What the city manager does. *Symposium.* Pub. Management. Oct.–Nov., 1945.

———. Relation of city manager to council. *Symposium.* Pub. Management. Dec., 1945.

———. Relation of city manager to council. *Symposium.* Pub. Management. Jan., 1946.

Control. The remote control of local government. *C. K. Alexander.* The Municipality. Feb., 1946.

County Government. County and township government in 1944. *Clyde F. Snider.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Dec., 1945.

Henry George. Henry George; the '86 mayoralty campaign. *A. G. deMille.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1946.

Housing. The city's rôle in the housing emergency. *J. B. Blandford, Jr.* Pub. Management. Dec., 1945.

Industry. Infusing new life into local industry. *H. S. Swan.* Pub. Management. Jan., 1946.

Local Government Abroad. To build or not to build. *Grant Crawford.* Farm electrification. *Andrew Stewart.* Local government in Australia. *F. A. Bland.* Pub. Affairs. Summer, 1945.

———. Greater London plan, 1944. *Gwilym Gibbon.* Pub. Admin. Winter, 1945–46.

———. An inquiry into juvenile delinquency in an English town. *R. H. Jones.* Soc. Service Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Lesson of the electrons. *Editors.* The Ratepayer. Dec., 1945.

———. The elector and the councillor. *J. E. MacColl* and *E. C. R. Hadfield.* Fortnightly. Dec., 1945.

———. Brazilian boom town. *Lawrence and Sylvia Martin.* Inter-American. Jan., 1946.

———. Shanghai; reopened under new management. *C. J. V. Murphy.* Fortune. Feb., 1946.

Personnel. In-service training for department heads. *Lester Jordan.* Pub. Management. Oct.–Nov., 1945.

———. Collective bargaining in the local public service. *Herbert Harris.* Am. City. Jan., 1946.

———. A sound policy on retirement plans for governmental employes. *Marvin Duel.* The Municipality. Feb., 1946.

Planning. How to simplify municipal work. *H. H. Fite.* Pub. Management. Oct.–Nov., 1945.

———. A balanced engineering plan for small-city modernization. *H. G. Matthews.* Am. City. Jan., 1946.

———. Advance planning of public works. *R. C. Ashton.* The Municipality. Feb., 1946.

Taxes. The problem of equalization as related to the present sale prices of real estate. *A. W. Noonan.* The Municipality. Feb., 1946.

Washington. The mayor of Washington. *Carlisle Bargeron.* Nation's Bus. Feb., 1946.

POLITICAL AND LEGAL PHILOSOPHY

Books and Pamphlets

Allen, C. K. Democracy and the individual. new ed. Pp. 112. London: Oxford. 1945.

Brodin, Pierre. Les idées politiques des États-Unis d'aujourdhui. Pp. 297. Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve. 1940.

Buckland, W. W. Some reflections on jurisprudence. Pp. 118. Cambridge: Univ. Press. 1945.

Cole, G. D. H. Persons and periods. Pp. 176. London: Penguin. 1945.

Cole, G. D. H. Scope and method in social and political theory. Pp. 16. London: Clarendon. 1945.

Collingwood, R. G. The idea of nature. Pp. 192. N.Y.: Oxford. 1945.

Conti, Giovanni, ed. L'idea repubblicana negli scittori politici dell' 800 e contemporanei. Pp. 384. Roma: Libreria politica moderna. 1944.

Dobb, Maurice. Political economy and capitalism. Pp. 357. N.Y.: Internatl. Pub. 1945.

Dorfman, Joseph. The economic mind in American civilization, 1606–1865. 2 v. Pp. 987. N.Y.: Viking Press. 1946.

Frondizi, Silvio. El estado moderno; ensayo de crítica constructiva. Pp. 174. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada. 1945.

Gangulea, N., comp. Teachings of Sun Yat-sen. Pp. 133. London: Sylvan. 1945.

Garaudy, Roger. Le communisme et la renaissance de la culture française. Pp. 63. Paris: Editions sociales. 1945.

Gonnard, René. La propriété dans la doctrine et dans l'histoire. Pp. 152. Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence. 1943.

Grennan, Margaret R. William Morris, mediaevalist and revolutionary. Pp. 180. N.Y.: King's Crown Press. 1945.

Jenkin, Thomas P. Reactions of major groups to positive government in the United States, 1930–1940. Pp. 166. Berkeley: Univ. of Cal. Press. 1945.

Kierkegaard, S. Attack upon "Christendom," 1854–1855,.Trans. from Danish. Pp. 322. London: Oxford. 1945.

Lewis, William D., and *Ellingston, John R.,* eds. Essential human rights. Pp. 195. (Annals, Am. Acad. Pol. & Soc. Sci., Jan., 1946). Philadelphia.

MacIver, R. M. Civilization and group relationships; a series of addresses and discussions. Pp. 190 (Inst. for Religious Studies Pubns.) N.Y.: Harper. 1945.

Mahoney, John J. For us the living; an approach to civic education. Pp. 344. N.Y.: Harper. 1945.

Menchini, Louis. The people's capitalism. Pp. 178. San Francisco: Hallesint Pub. Co. 1945.

Nadeau, Jean Marie. Entreprise privée et socialisme. Pp. 114. Montreal: B. Valiquette. 1944.

Noyelle, Henri. Révolution politique et révolution économique. Pp. 123. Paris: Recueil Sirey. 1945.

Nuesse, Celestine J. The social thought of American Catholics, 1634–1829. Pp. 315. Washington: Cath. Univ. of Amer. Press. 1945.

Petersen, Arnold. Daniel de Leon, social scientist. Pp. 79 N.Y.: N.Y. Labor News Co. 1945.

Popper, K. R. Open society and its enemies. Vol. I: age of Plato. Vol. II: high tide of prophecy; Hegel and Marx. 2 vols. Vol. I. Pp. 268; Vol. II., Pp. 352. London: Kegan Paul. 1945.

Rommen, H. A. The state in Catholic thought; a treatise in political philosophy. Pp. 747. St. Louis (Mo.): B. Herder Book Co. 1945.

Sheed, F. J. Communism and man. Pp. 207. London: Sheed and Ward. 1945.

Sturzo, Luigi. Spiritual problems of our times. Pp. 191. N.Y.: Longmans. 1945.

Trotsky, Leon. The first five years of the Communist International. Pp. 387. N.Y.: Pioneer. 1945.

Ward, Leo Richard, ed. United for freedom; coöperatives and Christian democracy. Pp. 272. Milwaukee: Bruce. 1945.

Wheeler, Francis L. God, man, and sin. Pp. 62. London: Skeffington. 1945.

Wild, John. Plato's theory of man; an introduction to the realistic philosophy of culture. Pp. 330. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press. 1945.

Articles

Atomic Era. With all our learning. *M. C. Otto.* Democracy and science fused by the atom bomb. *J. F. Sembower.* Atomic energy in practice. *Givilyn Owen.* Social control of atomic energy. *O. S. Loud.* Antioch Rev. Dec., 1945.

Catholic Theory. Naturalism and dogma. *Hubert N. Hart.* Cath. World. Jan., 1946.

Chinese Theory. Definition and scope of Chinese theory. *Chaing Kai-shek.* Amerasia. Jan., 1946.

De Bonald. Louis de Bonald. *Alexandre Koyré.* Jour. of Hist. of Ideas. Jan., 1946.

Democracy. Bureaucracy and the democratic system. *Charles S. Hyneman.* La. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Schumpeter on capitalism, socialism, and democracy. *Charles O. Hardy.* Jour. of Pol. Economy. Dec., 1945.

———. Designs for democracy. *F. L. Schuman.* Current Hist. Dec., 1945.

———. Social egalitarianism in a Tudor crisis. *W. Gordon Zeeveld.* Jour. of Hist. of Ideas. Jan., 1946.

———. Psychology and democracy. *John Bowlby.* Pol. Quar. Jan.–Mar., 1946.

De Tocqueville. The rôle of religion in the social philosophy of Alexis de Tocqueville. *Joachim Wach.* Jour. of Hist. of Ideas. Jan., 1946.

Economic Theory. The interest rate and investment in a dynamic society. *F. A. Lutz.* The concept of economic surplus. *K. E. Boulding.* The theory of economic behavior. *Leonid Hurwicz.* Am. Econ. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The physiocrats and Say's law of markets, II. *J. J. Spengler,* Jour. of Pol. Economy. Dec., 1945.

———. The theory of optimum population for a closed economy. *Manuel Gottlieb.* Deficiencies in the gross-national-product concept as a national measure. *Joseph Mayer.* Jour. of Pol. Economy. Dec., 1945.

———. Random reflections on a mature economy. *Howard R. Smith.* With due respect to Adam Smith. *W. J. Parish.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. Dec., 1945.

Education. The genteel tradition in liberal education. *Harold A. Taylor.* Antioch Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Some thoughts on education. *F. Neilson.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1946.

Fascism. The bio-social basis of thought in the third reich. *Morris E. Opler.* Ann. Sociol. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The fascist; an operational definition. *Gerard DeGré.* Soc. Forces. Dec., 1945.

French Theory. Ideas in France, 1939–1945. *H. I. Marrou.* Rev. of Politics. Jan., 1946.

Heroes and Hero-Worship. Some notes on social psychology of the hero. *Paul Meadows.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. Dec., 1945.

Jurisprudence. Some problems of legal analysis. *Emanuel Becker.* Yale Law Jour. Sept., 1945.

———. Language and the law, IV. *Glanville Williams.* Law Quar. Rev. Oct., 1945.

———. A descriptive theory of justice. *LeRoy Marceau.* La. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Bentham on the nature and method of law. *E. W. Patterson.* Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Rudolf von Jhering; or law as a means to an end. *William Seagle.* Univ. of Chicago Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard and Isaac Penington. *M. Whitcomb Hess.* Cath. World. Feb., 1946.

Liberalism. In defense of liberalism. *Desmond Pacey.* Can. Forum. Jan., 1946.

Liberty. The civil liberties doctrines of Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Cardozo. *Leonard Oppenheim.* Tulane Law Rev. Dec., 1945.

Luther. Demogogue or people's leader? (II) Martin Luther. *F. H. Cramer.* Current Hist. Dec., 1945.

Maritain. Jacques Maritain: philosopher of our age, I. *C. J. Eustace.* Cath. World. Feb., 1946.

Marxism. The "withering away" of the state. *Solomon F. Bloom.* Jour. of Hist. of Ideas. Jan., 1946.

———. A critique of Marxian ideology. *Helen Constas.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

Mill. John Stuart Mill and the Saint Simonians. *J. R. Hainds.* Jour. of the Hist. of Ideas. Jan., 1946.

Pacifism. The decay of liberal pacifism. *R. H. Crum.* Enquiry. Fall, 1945.

———. Non-violence and revolution. *Don Calhoun.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

Personalism. Personalism against totalitarianism. *Will Herberg.* Politics. Dec., 1945.

Philosophy of History. What kind of future? *W. R. Inge.* Fortnightly. Nov., 1945.

———. After world war II. *Waldemar Gurian.* Rev. of Politics. Jan., 1946.

Proudhon. Proudhon—an uncomfortable thinker. *Nicolas Chiaromonte.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

Religion and Politics. What about church unity? *Bernard I. Bell.* Atlantic. Jan., 1946.

Revolution. Exchange: Revolution sacred and profane. *Virgil Vogel*; *Philip Selznick.* Enquiry. Fall, 1945.

———. Revolution, sociolatry, and war. *Paul Goodman.* Politics. Dec., 1945.

Socialism. Towards a socialist program. *European.* Politics. Dec., 1945.

———. Professor Hayek on German socialism: I. *B. F. Hoselitz*; II. *Eduard Heimann.* Am. Econ. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Socialist international. *Robert Alexander.* Can. Forum. Jan., 1946.

———. Towards a personalist socialist philosophy. *Albert Votaw.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

Sociological Theory. Religious origins and sociological theory. *Thomas H. Grafton.* Am. Sociol. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. Concepts in sociology. *E. S. Bogardus.* Sociol. & Soc. Research. Jan.–Feb., 1946.

Summer. American masters and contemporary sociology, I. William Graham Summer. *Donald W. Calhoun.* Soc. Forces. Oct., 1945.

Tradition. Are we a people without a history? *Max Lerner.* Va. Quar. Rev. Winter, 1946.

Utopianism. Utopianism and power. *Mulford Sibley.* Enquiry. Fall, 1945.

MISCELLANEOUS

Books and Pamphlets

Ferm, Vergilius. An encyclopedia of religion. Pp. 844. N.Y.: Philosophical Lib. 1945.

MacKinney, L. C., and *Others.* A state university surveys the humanities. Pp. 273. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N.C. Press. 1945.

Micklem, Nathaniel. The labyrinth; a philosophical poem. Pp. 50. N.Y.: Oxford. 1945.

Newman, Chaim, ed. Gentile and Jew; a symposium on the future of the Jewish people; forward by Lord Strabolgi. Pp. 371. N.Y.: Oceana Pub. Co., 500 Fifth Ave. 1945.

Articles

Atom and the Future. Pilot lights of the Apocalypse; a playlet in one act. *Louis N. Ridenour.* Fortune. Jan., 1946.

Legal Satire. Fardell vs. Potts—the reasonable man. *A. P. Herbert.* Conn. Bar. Jour. Oct., 1945.

Nazi Fiction. Personality structure and nazi fiction. *Svend Riemer.* Soc. Forces. Oct., 1945.

Political Satire. The story of John Mann. *Ben Ray Redman.* Politics. Jan., 1946.

Public Opinion Polls. Attitude polls—servants or masters? *Edward L. Bernays.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Fall, 1945.

Social Sciences. Some critical remarks on man's science of man. *Kurt Riezler.* Soc. Research. Nov., 1945.

———. The nature of scientific method. *Felix Kaufmann.* Soc. Research. Nov., 1945.

———. Must the social sciences foster moral skepticism? *Claude C. Bowman.* Am. Sociol. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. History—a science? *C. P. Gould.* Miss. Valley Hist. Rev. Dec., 1945.

———. The unity of science movement. *David L. Miller.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. Dec., 1945.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

MILES O. PRICE
Law Library, Columbia University

AMERICAN

UNITED STATES

Civil Service Commission

Official register of United States, 1945 . . . as of May 1, 1945. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. xiv+397 p. $1.00.

Commerce Department

Census bureau. City documents, No. 1, January, 1946: City periodic financial reports. "This bibliography precedes a comprehensive list of city government documents planned for early publication by the Bureau of the Census. In addition

to city charters and codes, the forthcoming list will comprise all periodically issued general and departmental reports." Washington, 1946. 28 p. (processed.)

——— City finances: 1943. [Cities having populations over 25,000] Volume 3: Statistical compendium. . . . Prepared under the supervision of E. R. Gray, chief, Governments division, Bureau of the census. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 224 p. (processed.)

——— State finances, 1944: v. 1, Individual state reports. (Separate processed reports have been issued for all 48 states, for the year ending June 30, 1944.) Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945.

——— Judicial criminal statistics: 1943. (During 1945 separate reports were issued for each state, usually one page per state.)

——— Estimated population of the United States for selected dates, July 1, 1940–July 1, 1945. Washington: 1946. 2 p. (processed.)

Congress

House of representatives. International air transport policy. Letter from the attorney-general of the United States . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 45 p. map. (79th Cong., 1st Sess., House doc. No. 142.)

——— Servicemen's federal income taxes, questions and answers explanatory of federal income tax laws with respect to members of the armed forces of United States in World War II. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 40 p. (79th Cong., 1st Sess., H. doc. No. 379.)

——— U. S. antitrust laws, with amendments, 1890–1945. E. A. Lewis, comp. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 90 p. 20¢.

———*Indian affairs committee.* Creation of Indian claims commission, hearings, 69th Cong., 1st Sess., on H.R. 1198 and H.R. 1341, bills to create Indian claims commission. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 178 p. 30¢.

——— *Judiciary committee.* Termination of hostilities and extension of 2d war powers act of 1942, hearings . . . 79th Cong., 1st Sess. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 132 p. 20¢.

——— *Postwar immigration and naturalization, Select committee to investigate and study laws and problems relating to.* Immigration and naturalization laws and problems, interim report pursuant to H.Res. 52, . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 21 p. (H. rp. 1312, 79th Cong., 1st Sess.)

——— *Special committee to investigate executive agencies.* Hearings . . . pursuant to H.Res. 88, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 3 pts. 991 p. pt. 1, $1.25; pts. 2–3, 15¢ each.

——— *Ways and means committee. Social security technical staff.* Issues in social security: a report pursuant to H.Res. 204, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 742 p. tables, charts.

——— *World war veterans' legislation committee.* Hearings, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., on H.R. 3749. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 272 p.

Senate. Trial of German war criminals: opening address of Robert H. Jackson . . . together with a copy of the indictment. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 92 p. (S. doc. 126, 79th Cong., 1st Sess.)

——— Water treaty of Colorado River and Rio Grande favors Mexico; translation of article from El Universal, Mexico City newspaper, Aug. 1, 1945, report given to Mexican Senate by Adolfo Orive Alba, executive chairman of national irrigation commission of Mexico. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 19 p. (S. doc. 98, 79th Cong., 1st Sess.) 10¢.

——— Survey of electoral college in political system of United States, by Joseph

Jackson; presented by Mr. Harch. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. iii, 17 p. (S. doc. 97, 79th Cong., 1st Sess.) 10¢.

——— *Appropriations committee.* United Nations relief and rehabilitation administration, 1946, hearings . . . on H.J. Res. 266, making additional appropriation for UNRRA [fiscal] year 1946. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 123 p. 20¢.

——— *Banking and currency committee.* Inflation control program of OPA, hearings, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., on controlling inflation. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 73 p. 15¢.

——— Financial control of government corporations, report to accompany H.R. 3660; submitted by Mr. Fulbright for himself and Mr. Butler. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 19 p. (S. rp. 694, 79th Cong., 1st Sess.)

——— *Education and labor committee.* Federal aid for education: hearing on S. 181, S. 717, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 2 pts., 999 p.

——— *Judiciary committee.* Administrative procedure act, report on S. 7, to improve administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure [in Government agencies] . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 45 p. (S. rp. 752, 79th Cong., 1st Sess.)

——— Alien census count, hearing before subcommittee, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., on S.J. Res. 85, proposing to amend Constitution of United States to exclude aliens in counting whole number of persons in each state for apportionment of representatives among the several states. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. iii, 14 p.

——— Equal rights amendment, hearing before subcommittee, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., on S.J. Res. 61, proposing amendment to Constitution of United States relative to equal rights for men and women. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 158 p. 25¢.

——— Term of President of United States, hearings . . . 79th Cong., 1st Sess., on S.J. Res. 1, proposing amendment . . . relating to terms of office of the President, S.J. Res. 10, proposing amendment . . . relating to terms of President of United States, S.J. Res. 12, proposing amendment . . . for providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote . . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 19 p. 10¢.

——— *Military affairs committee.* Department of armed forces, Department of military security . . . Hearing, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., on S. 84 and S. 1482. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 707 p. (Hearings on the proposed merger of the fighting forces.)

——— Hearings on science legislation. (S. 1297 and related bills, 79th Cong., 1st Sess.) Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. pt. 1, 198 p. 20¢. (Atom bomb control, etc.)

Justice Department

Immigration and naturalization service. Citizenship education through the use of class-developed materials: a guide for use in the public schools by teachers of candidates for naturalization, by M. C. Evans and V. P. Morey. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 60 p. 15¢.

Library of Congress

General reference and bibliography division. League of nations, intellectual coöperation program, list of references. Washington, 1945. 20 p. (processed.)

——— Postwar problems, current list of United States government publications, Jan.–Dec., 1944, with cumulative index, comp. by Kathrine Oliver Murra. . . . Washington: 1945, 100, 57, 104, xxix p. (processed.)

Information and publications office. Information bulletin. (Issued on Friday of each week, this informal processed bulletin of four pages is a news bulletin for the staff of the Library of congress.)

Legislative reference service. Bibliography of publications by members of Congress. Washington, 1945. 13 p. (mim.)

——— Development of good neighbor policy (Jan., 1942–July, 1945). Washington, 1945. 67 p. (processed.) (Public affairs bulletin 37.)

——— Pros and cons *re* amendments to fair labor standards act, based on hearings before Senate committee on education and labor, Sept. 25–Oct. 10, 1945, prepared especially for House labor committee . . . by Gustav Peck. Washington, 1945. 13 p.

——— Time limits for temporary provisions of federal law (not including provisions which expire on specific dates.) Washington, 1945. 25 p. (processed.)

National Archives

Germany surrenders unconditionally; facsimiles of documents. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1944. 41 p. il. (In English, Russian, German.)

National Labor Relations Board

Statutes and reports pertaining to the national labor relations board. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 141 p. 25¢.

Navy Department

Civilian administrators and specialists under the naval government, Pacific island areas, by Lt. J. Clement Lapp, USNR. Pearl Harbor, T. H., 1945. 45 p. (mim.)

President

Office of price administration. Price control, December, 1945. [Statement by] Chester Bowles. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 94 p. (Before Senate small business committee, Dec. 4, 1945.)

State Department

The following numbered publications are noted:

2361. Blair House, past and present. An account of its life and times in the city of Washington. Washington: Dept. of State, 1945. 38 p. and 16 unnumbered plates.

2382. Proposed educational and cultural organization of the United Nations. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 27 p.

2389. Status of countries in relation to the War, August 12, 1945. Comp. by Katharine Elizabeth Crane. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 13 p. 10¢.

2396. Armistice: Agreement between the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Hungary together with annex and protocol and letter of January 17, 1945—Agreement signed at Moscow, January 29, 1945. . . . Executive agreement series 456. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 32 p. 10¢.

2398. Report on first session of the council of foreign ministers. By James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State. Oct. 5, 1945. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 10 p. 5¢.

2400. Military aviation mission: Agreement between the United States of America and Guatemala. . . . Executive agreement series 466. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off. By Francis J. Colligan. Inter American Series 27. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 11 p. 5¢.

2408. Treaty developments, 1944. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 36p. 10¢.
2411. Proposals for expansion of world trade and employment. Commercial policy series 79. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 30p. 10¢.
2414. Exchange of specialists and distinguished leaders in the Western hemisphere. By Francis J. Colligan. Inter-American Series 27. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 12p. 5¢.
2420. Trial of war criminals. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 89 p. 20¢.
2423. The Axis in defeat: a collection of documents on the American policy toward Germany and Japan. 118 p. 30¢.
2438. Memorandum on the postwar international information program of the United States, by Arthur W. Macmahon. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1945. 135 p. 30¢.
2442. Covenant of the League of nations and Charter of the United nations, Points of difference, by Clyde Eagleton. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 14 p. 5¢. (Reprinted from the Department of State Bulletin of Aug. 19, 1945.)
2448. Report on Moscow meeting of foreign ministers, by James F. Byrnes, Secretary of state. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 18 p. 10¢.
2454. The British loan—What it means to us: a radio broadcast by Fred M. Vinson and Dean Acheson. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 19 p. 10¢.
2456. Our inter-American policy; a radio broadcast by Spruille Braden . . . and Ellis O. Briggs. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 17 p. 5¢.
——— Consultation among American republics with respect to the Argentine situation. Memorandum of the United States Government. . . . Washington, 1946. 131 p. (mim.) [This is the blue book relating to Argentina's treatment of Nazis. By the time this list appears in print, a numbered and printed edition will be available.]
——— Reparation from Germany. Final act and annex of the Paris conference on reparation. (In Department of State, Bulletin, Jan. 27, 1946, p. 114–24.)
———Sino-Soviet treaty of friendship and alliance. Treaty of friendship and alliance between the Republic of China and the U.S.S.R. (In Department of State, Bulletin, Feb. 10, 1946, p. 201–08. Map.)

Supreme Command for the Allied Powers

Summation of non-military activities in Japan and Korea for Sept.–Oct. 1945. n.p. 1945. 185 p. (mim.) tables, charts.

War Department

Army information bureau. Information and editorial division. The legal case against the Nuremberg defendants. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 8 p. (Army talk 108.)
Office of the Director, Office of Military Government (U. S. zone), United States forces, European theater. Reports and information branch. A great many publications, in series and separately, have been issued from July, 1945, to date, and most of them are no longer restricted. There is "Military government, Weekly information bulletin," number 1 appearing July 28, 1945. It is an informal news sheet, as its name indicates. There is also the "Military government gazette, Germany, Sixth army group area of control," in English and German, appearing regularly. It contains, without comment, the text, in English and German, of the enactments of Military government from September 18, 1945. There is the "Monthly report of Military governor, U. S. Zone 20," with printed title page and processed text, appearing in many separate parts each month. The issue of December, 1945, is in 13 parts, on transportation, displaced persons, refugees,

denazification and public safety, demilitarization, coal, etc. There are large mimeographed "handbooks," covering the period from July 7, 1945, being for the most part the first form in which rules and orders relating to the military government appear. On October 4, 1945, a separate pamphlet was issued by the Headquarters, U. S. forces, European theater: Plan for the administration of justice, U. S. Zone (English and German texts.) 19 p. There are many separate placards, posters, etc. Some of this material is available from the Civil Affairs Administration, War Department, Washington, D. C.

STATE AND TERRITORIAL

ALABAMA

University of Alabama, University. Bureau of public administration. Alabama's people, by Lillian Worley. University, Ala., 1945. 56 p. maps.

ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson. "Wards of the U. S.": Arizona applications; a study of the legal status of Indians, by N. D. Houghton. Tucson, 1946. 19 p. (Soc. sci. bul. no. 14.) 15¢.

CALIFORNIA

State reconstruction and reëmployment commission. California planning. Sacramento 14, 631 J. St , 1946. 65 p. tables, maps.

University of California, Berkeley. California government: politics and administration, by W. W. Crouch and D. E. McHenry. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1945. 344 p. $3.00.

——— *Bureau of public administration.* County government in California. Berkeley, 1945. 69 p. (mim.)

——— Financial aspects of health insurance, with particular reference to AB800 and AB449, by S. C. May Berkeley 48, 1945. 35 p. (mim.) (1945 legislative proposal no. 3). 50¢.

——— State administrative machinery for the conciliation and mediation of labor disputes. Berkeley, 1945. 48 p. (mim.)

Oakland. Public library, Reference department. Public welfare, public health, and public safety, including fire protection and police science. Oakland, 1945. 59 p. (mim.) (Quarterly bulletin of recent publications on municipal government and administration, no. 86–90, pat. 2.)

CONNECTICUT

Legislative council. Committee to study problem of the criminally insane. Report. Hartford, State Capitol, 1945. 29 p. (mim.)

State library. Public records of the state of Connecticut from May, 1785, through January, 1789. L. W. Labaree, comp. Hartford 1, 1945. 642 p. $5.00.

FLORIDA

Legislature. Special joint economy and efficiency committee. Report. 1943. Tallahassee, 1945. 343 p. tables, charts.

ILLINOIS

Legislative council, Research dept. Adult education in Illinois: report pursuant to proposal no. 196. Springfield, 1945. 54 p. (mim.)

Legislative council, Research dept. Sterilization laws: report pursuant to proposal no. 199. Springfield, 1945, 27 p. (mim.) (Pub. no. 71.)

University of Illinois, Urbana. History of social-democratic party in Milwaukee, 1897–1910, by M. Wachman. Urbana, Univ. of Ill. Press, 1945. 90 p. bib. (Illinois studies in the social sciences, v. 28, no. 1.) $1.50.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky, Lexington. Bureau of business research. The Kentucky state budget system. by J. W. Martin and Vera Briscoe. Lexington. University of Kentucky Press. 1945. 103 p. (no. 11) 50¢.

MASSACHUSETTS

Cambridge. City manager. Postwar Cambridge: report to the city council on postwar plans; rev. ed. Cambridge, 1945. 93 p. (mim.) tables, charts, maps.

MICHIGAN

Port Huron, City planning commission. A program for a master plan and for public works and improvements. . . . I. S. Shatuck. Minneapolis 2, Minn., 200 Foshay Tower, 1945. v.p. (mim.)

NEW JERSEY

Commission on state administrative reorganization. Report: pt. 3. Trenton, 1945. 33 p.

NEW YORK

Department of commerce, Bureau of planning. Local planning and zoning: a manual of powers and procedures for cities and government officials. Albany, 1945. 67 p.

New York (City). Budget bureau. Budget for the fiscal year 1945–1946. New York, Municipal Bldg., 1945. 485 p.

New York (City). Mayor. New York advancing; victory ed.; seven more years of progressive administration in the City of New York, 1939–1945, F. H. LaGuardia, Mayor. New York, Municipal Reference Library, 2230 Municipal Bldg., 1945. 393 p. (Rebecca R. Rankin, ed.) $1.00.

OHIO

Cleveland. Bureau of government research. Subcommittee on police survey. The Cleveland police survey. Cleveland, 1945. 136 p. tables, charts. $1.00.

Greenville. City planning commission. Comprehensive city plan. Greenville, 1945. 98 p. il., tables.

OREGON

Multnomah County, Tax supervising and conservation commission. Budget facts and financial statistics for 1945–1946: 1944–45 annual report. Portland 4, 400 County court house, 1945. 80 p. tables, charts.

University of Oregon, Eugene. Bureau of municipal research and service. Comparative tax rates in Oregon cities, 1945–46. Eugene, 1945. 10 p. (mim.) (Information bulletin no. 62.)

——— Salary rates of officials in 159 Oregon cities. Eugene, 1945. 17 p. (mim.) (Information bulletin no. 61.)

PENNSYLVANIA

Legislative reference bureau. A compilation of the laws relating to state taxation, revenue, and fiscal affairs, annotated. B. R. Glidden, comp. Rev. ed. Harrisburg, Dept. of Property and Supplies, 1945. 352 p. (Bul. no. 28.) 50¢.

Postwar planning commission. Interim report, July, 1944–July, 1945. Harrisburg, Box 335, 1945. 40 p.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Preparedness for peace commission. Report to the governor and members of the general assembly on organization and administration of the state government of South Carolina. . . . Columbia, Wade Hampton Office Bldg., 1945. 682 p. tables.

TENNESSEE

University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Bureau of public administration. The administrative release system of the Tennessee valley authority, by H. F. Gough. Knoxville, 1945. 62 p. (mim.)

VIRGINIA

Commission to study the sales and use tax. Report to the governor and general assembly. Richmond, Div. of Purchase and Ptg., 1945. 76 p.

WASHINGTON

Department of state. The counties of Washington: 1944 supp. R. M. Perry, comp. Olympia, 1945. unp. maps.

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL

Laws of occupied and enemy countries for the period of World War II are now for the most part available, including those of governments in exile. Dealers in these countries have done a remarkable job of collecting and holding this material for their subscribers, and shipments generally for the period are complete. Paradoxically, it is more difficult to acquire the current material now than the wartime laws. The Commerce Clearing House, publisher of loose-leaf services, issued in January, 1946, volume 1, number 1, of a monthly periodical entitled "World Trade Law Journal," which is expected to contain both translations into English of the commercial laws of the world and articles about them.

ARGENTINA

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de derecho y ciencias sociales, Instituto Argentino de derecho internacional. El pensamiento internacional de Alberdi, por Isidoro Ruiz Moreno (h.). Buenos Aires, Imp. de la Universidad, 1945. 137 p.

BRAZIL

Ministério das relacões exteriores. Bibliografia de historia de Brasil. 2o. semestre de 1944. Rio de Janeiro, Imprensa Nacional, 1945. 73 p.

CANADA

Department of external affairs. Proposals for expansion of world trade and employment . . . together with the text of the financial agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States signed at Washington on Dec. 6, 1945, and related documents. Ottawa, Edmond Cloutier, 1945. 34 p. (Conf. ser. 1945, no. 3.)

House of commons. Standing committee on banks and commerce. Bill no. 238: an act for carrying into effect the agreements for an international monetary fund . . . minutes of proceedings and evidence and report to House . . . Ottawa, King's Printer, 1945. 152 p.

CHILE

Universidad de Chile. Jurisprudencia de la constitucion política de 1925 . . . por Carlos Reyes Mason. Santiago de Chile, Imp. el Imparcial, 1944. 74 p. (thesis)

—— El concepto de igualdad en las leyes sociales Chilenas . . . por Augusto Araya Ochoa. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Mediterránea, 1944. 79 p. (thesis)

CUBA

Archivo nacional. Correspondencia diplomática de la delegacion Cubana en Nueva York durante la guerra de independencia de 1895 a 1898. Tomo III, Francia. La Habana, 1945. 162 p. (Publicaciones del Archivo nacional de Cuba, VI.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Government information service, New York. The struggle for the liberation of the republic and the rehabilitation of the state, by Eduard Benes. New York, Czechoslovak Govt. Information Service, 1790 Broadway, 1945. 39 p. (mim.)

ECUADOR

Constitución política de la República del Ecuador, dictada por la Asamblea

nacional constituyente de 1944–1945 y promulgada el 6 de marzo de 1945. Quito, Talleres gráficos nacionales, 1945. 136 p.

GREAT BRITAIN

Attorney-general's office. Indictment presented to the international military tribunal . . . for the prosecution and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis. Lond: H. M. S. O., 1945. 50 p. (Cmd. 6696)/9.

Colonial office. Ceylon: statement of policy on constitutional reform. London: H. M. S. O., 1945. 8 p. (Cmd. 6690.)/2.

——— Colonial regulations: being regulations for His Majesty's colonial service: pt. 1, Public officers. London: H. M. S. O., 1945. 40 p./9.

——— Development and welfare in the West Indies, 1943–44: report . . . by Frank Stockdale. London: H. M. S. O., 1945. 115 p. (Col. no. 189.)

Foreign office. Agreement between H. M. Government in the United Kingdom and the provisional government of the French Republic relating to money and property situated in France and the United Kingdom which have been subjected to special measures in consequence of the enemy occupation of France. London: H. M. S. O., 1945. 11 p. (Cmd. 6675.)/2.

——— Final act of the Paris conference on reparation (with annex), Paris, Dec. 21, 1945. London: H. M. S. O., 1946. 18 p. (Cmd. 6721.)/3.

United Nations preparatory commission. Executive committee. Report. London: H. M. S. O., 144 p. 4/.

NICARAGUA

Ministerio de instrucción. Gobernantes de Nicaragua, 1825–1927. 2a ed. . . . por Sara L. Barquero. Managua, Talleres nacionales de imprenta y encuadernación, 1945. 248 p. (Publicaciones del Ministerio de instrucción.)

PERU

Consejo provincial de Lima. IV centenario de la fundación de la ciudad. Libros de cabildos de lima . . . (años 1598–1601) descifrado y anotado por don Juan Bromley. Lima, Torres Aguirre, 1944. 783 p.

RUSSIA

Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as amended and supplemented by the first, second, third, sixth, seventh, and eighth sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Washington, Embassy of the U.S.S.R., 1945. 31 p.

VENEZUELA

Universidad central de Venezuela. La contribución de Venezuela al Panamericanismo durante el periodo 1939–1943, por Eduardo Plaza A . . . Carácas, Tip. Americana, 1945. 225 p. (thesis).

ARAB INFORMATION OFFICE

Arab news bulletin. Washington, D. C., Wardman Park Hotel, 1945. (Vol. 1, number 1, of this weekly bulletin appeared Dec. 14, 1945.

CONTROL COUNCIL FOR GERMANY

Official gazette. No. 1, 29 Oct. 1945—Berlin, Allied Secretariat, 32, Elssholzstrasze. (This gazette, with no data as to frequency of publication, prints the proclamations, orders, laws, etc., of the Control council for Germany, in parallel columns, in French, Russian, German, and English.)

INTERIM INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION SERVICE, NEW YORK. LIBRARY

The legal basis of the Nuremberg trial, by Adolf Lande. New York, 1945. xix p. (processed.)

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL

Criminality of das Korps der politischen leiter der nationalsozializtischen deutschen Arbeiterpartei (Leadership corps of the Nazi party). Trial brief. 1945. (This

mimeographed brief, of 88 plus 76 pages, was prepared by Thomas F. Lambert, jr., Lt. (j.g.), U.S.N.R., of counsel. It is a typical legal brief, with citations to authority, etc. Eventually there will be available a complete set of the stenographic record and of the American and British documents introduced in evidence. Perhaps the French and Russian documents also.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Committees of the League of nations: classified list and essential facts. Geneva, 1945. 73 p. (V. Legal 1945. V. 2)

List of conventions, with indication of the relevant articles conferring powers on the organs of the League of nations. Geneva, 1945. 160 p. (V. Legal. 1945. V. 1.)

Report of the work of the League of nations, 1943–1944. Geneva, 1945, 100 p.

Report of the work of the League during the war, submitted to the Assembly by the acting Secretary-general. Geneva, 1945. 167 p. (General. 1945. 2.)

(All the above League documents for sale by International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, New York 27, N. Y.)

PAN AMERICAN UNION

Emergency advisory committee for political defence. Second annual report, July 15, 1943–Oct. 15, 1944 . . . with an appendix containing the recommendations approved during this period, and other documents. Washington, 1945. 154 p.

UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations Information Office, 610 Fifth Avenue, New York 20, N. Y., is distributing the documents of the meetings of the UN Assembly in London and the Report of the Preparatory commission. "This material is printed in the United States by photo reproduction from documents and microfilm flown from London as soon as possible after it is issued . . . ." These documents comprise the following series, all beginning January, 1946:

Journal of the general assembly; Documents distributed to general assembly; General committee of assembly; First to sixth committees, summary of records and documents distributed; League of nations committee, Summary record of meetings; Journal of the Security council; Journal of the Economic and social council: Report of the Preparatory commission of the United Nations (1945, 151 p.); Report by the Executive committee to the Preparatory commission (1945, 144 p.)

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION ORGANIZATION, NEW YORK

Documents of the United Nations conference on international organization, San Francisco, 1945. Volume XV, Coördination committee; the charter; lists. (This is the final volume of this series, except that an index volume will appear later.)

NOTES ON SOME RECENT DOCUMENTARY MATERIALS

JAMES B. CHILDS

Library of Congress

The extent to which the principal regional government in the United States Zone in Germany is functioning is mirrored in the *Bayerisches Gesetz- und Verordnungsblatt, amtliches Nachrichtenblatt der Bayerischen Landesregierung*, which began publication at Munich with Number 1 on September 15, 1945. A new administration for Bavaria east of the Rhine was set up by the Military Government at the end of May, 1945, and a statement of "Our Task," signed by Fritz Schäffer, temporary minister president of Bavaria, appears in No. 1. A more elaborate program of the new Bavarian state government as reconstituted under temporary minister presi-

dent Wilhelm Hoegner on October 22, 1945, appears in No. 4, dated November 1. Content of the laws, ordinances, and decrees printed in the first five numbers of the *Bayerisches Gesetz- und Verordnungsblatt* between September 15 and November 7, 1945, is almost entirely within the economic field, as indicated by the following titles: emergency, income tax, price formation and control, termination of "iron saving," elimination of black-market activities, functioning of offices, establishment of economic control agencies, formation of associations for commercial economy, establishment of chambers for handicraft, and dissolution of economic associations. Text of all documents is published in German and English in parallel columns.

The over-all enactments of the Allied Control Council for Germany, created at Berlin as of August 30, 1945, are promulgated in the *Official gazette of the control council for Germany* beginning with no. 1 dated October 29, 1945. The gazette, which contains the proclamations, laws, and orders, as well as directives and instructions, is published in English, Russian, and French as official languages, German text being furnished only as a matter of convenience, and has the title also in French as *Journal officiel*, in Russian as *Vedomosti*, and in German as *Amtsblatt*. In the first number (23 pages) are contained Proclamation 1 establishing the Control Council, Order 1 prohibiting the wearing of uniforms by former members of the German armed forces, Law 1 repealing Nazi laws, Proclamation 2 imposing certain additional requirements on Germany, Law 2 providing for the termination and liquidation of Nazi organizations, Proclamation 3 stating fundamental principles of judicial reform, and Law 3 providing for increase in the rates of taxation.

For the United States and British zones in Germany, *Military government gazette*, Germany No. 3, was printed late in September, 1945, as of July 14, 1945, containing together with Gazette No. 2 all legislation that was in effect, the texts in No. 1 having apparently been entirely superseded. No. 3 was issued with different title-pages for the United States Zone, Eastern military district, for the U. S., Western military district, and for the Twenty-first army area of control, British zone.

In the Soviet Zone of Germany, each of the enactments of the Soviet military administration at Berlin, which was created under date of June 9, 1945, is promulgated only in Russian in separate leaflets with the title *Prikaz* [Order] . . . the format being similar to that of the current Soviet law collections.

In the French Zone of Germany, the enactments, regulations, and other acts of the Commandement en chef français en Allemagne, created by decree of June 15, 1945, have been published at Baden Baden in a *Journal officiel du Commandement en chef français en Allemagne, Gouvernement militaire de la zone française d' occupation*, beginning with No. 1 dated September 3, 1945. Text is in French and German and the gazette has also the German title: *Amtsblatt des französischen Oberkommandos in Deutschland*. Only the French is regarded as official, the parallel German text being added simply as a matter of information. The Frenzh zone is composed of the provinces of Baden, Württemberg, Hesse-Palatinate, Rhineland, and the Saar. Each province has a separate *Bulletin officiel*, or *Landesamtsblatt*, containing the orders effective only in that area.

For the Allied Military Government in Italy, the record of the enactments and other acts as contained in the three numbers of the *Sicily gazette* and the one number of the *Italy gazette* needs to be supplemented by the *Allied military government gazette* for Venezia Julia issued at Trieste. This latter publication, printed in English, Italian, and Slovene editions, contains not only the general orders and orders applicable to the whole territory of Venezia Julia, but the area orders for Trieste,

Gorizia, and Pola. Allied Military Government was terminated in Italy as of December 31, 1945, except in Udine and Venezia Julia, where the problem of final sovereignty still awaits settlement.

In Korea, where eventual independence is being prepared for, the enactments, orders, etc., of the military government in the southern portion of the country occupied by the United States Army Forces, are being issued in separate leaflets in small octavo size, having text in English and Korean and being printed at Seoul. Military control over Southern Korea was established by proclamation dated September 7, 1945, by the Commanding General, United States Army Forces in the Pacific, at Yokahama, Japan. The first *Ordinance* of the military governor at Seoul, dated September 24, 1945, established a bureau of public health. Ordinance 8, October 1, set up a foreign affairs section of the Secretariat of the Government. Ordinance 28, November 13, established the office of the director of national defense, and Ordinance 29, November 16, created a Korean personnel review board. The first of the series of *General Orders*, dated October 5, dealt with the free market in rice. Further, there was a separate series of leaflets entitled *Appointments*, another entitled *Removals*, and still another *Bureau of Justice Orders*. Office files of all these orders would seem to be referred to as "Korea gazette."

In *Circular* No. 20, dated January 19, 1946, the War Department removed the restricted classification from the extensive series of *Civil affairs handbooks* prepared under the general supervision of Lieut. Col. James H. Shoemaker, late of Brown University. More than 180 parts were issued devoted to the Axis and Axis-occupied countries. The general plan provided for a series of monographs on each country according to the following arrangement. (1) geographical and social background; (2) government and administration; (3) legal affairs; (4) government finance; (5) money and banking; (6) natural resources; (7) agriculture; (8) industry and commerce; (9) labor; (10) public works and utilities; (11) transportation systems; (12) communications; (13) public health and sanitation; (14) public safety; (15) education; (16) public welfare; (17) cultural institutions. Most extensive coverage was given to Germany, Italy, and Japan. All the *Civil affairs handbooks* were issued in the series *Army Service Forces Manual*, Nos. 351–370.